

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*.

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke*.

No. 10.

JANUARY, 1930.

VOL. XIX.

A RECURRING QUESTION

Christ, when You walked in Galilee,
Did your calm humorous glance foresee
Your Body's toil, Your Body's shame
Would fail to win for us Your Name,
That every truth You patient taught
Would raise a dozen schools of thought,
Each to obscure the clarity
Of Your o'erwhelming charity?

Had You foreknowledge, as You spoke
To simple and self-righteous folk,
That truth in all You said and did
Would in our day be largely hid
And all the help You came to bring
Be stultified by bickering,
Each zealous for his point of view,
Apparently forgetting You?

Christ, as You walked in weariness,
Did Your shrewd judgment oft assess
The chances that Your teaching would
Ever be clearly understood,
Spending, and gladly being spent,
Being through Love so confident,
Despite Thy Church, we should pierce through
Her mists of doctrine and see You?

S.M.T.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

THE ROMAN WOLVES AND THE ENGLISH SHEPHERD.

The *Times* on December 28th published in large type a long and violent attack on the Bishop of Birmingham by Mr. Alf Noyes. Mr. Noyes, whom the historians honour as a poet, and the poets as a historian, roundly charged the Bishop with disloyalty to the essentials of the Christian Faith. This disloyalty he alleged, the Bishop managed to conceal by means of many reservations and verbal ambiguities. Were the Bishop not in the pulpit, but in the witness-box, Mr. Noyes opined that he, as cross-examining counsel on behalf of orthodoxy would quickly reveal the Bishop to be a Unitarian or a Manichee. Letters which appeared subsequently in small print in the *Times*, indicated that the poet had somewhat overrated his skill as a theologian. So far from being himself an orthodox believer, he seemed only too clear that he was of that particular brand of heretic, not at all uncommon among lay-zealots, technically known as an anthropomorphic tritheist.

In contrast to the traitor-Bishop seated in dignity and ruled with power, Mr. Noyes, inspired by the *afflatus divinus* of the poet, the *saeva indignatio* of the moralist, and the *odium theologicum* of the ecclesiastical controversialist, beheld the visage of an Anglican clergyman of unblemished orthodoxy, who merely desired to practice Reservation for devotional purposes, being driven forth from the Church of England simply because of 'excessive devotion.' In the poet's estimation this amazing lack of integrity manifest in the policy and administration of the Church of England deserved the sternest condemnation.

Now if Mr. Noyes were an English Churchman this pulpit and violent attack on the Bishop of Birmingham, although perhaps somewhat injudicious on the part of one who knows so little of theology, would yet be justifiable as prompted by the sincere desire to save the Church of England from false pastors and wolves in sheep's clothing. When however it is realized that Mr. Noyes is a Roman Catholic layman, the attack assumes somewhat sinister complexion, especially if we picture to ourselves Father Francis Woodlock, the clever Jesuit contro-

alist, coaching Mr. Noyes beforehand, albeit with no great success, in the use of theological terminology. Mr. Noyes' public attack on Dr. Barnes is then seen to be but one more move in a carefully-planned and widely-extended campaign directed against the National Church by the alien Romanist Church in this country.

We, although no Castalian draught has passed our lips, have also had a vision, but in sharp contrast to that beheld by Mr. Noyes. It is a vision of a flock of silly, panic-stricken sheep helplessly driven from pleasant English pastures by skilful and angry wolves, to leap to their doom over the white cliffs of Dover, while a faithful English shepherd is seen striving with skill and courage to check their mad career.

In such a campaign, to return to our original metaphor, it is only natural that the Bishop of Birmingham should be singled out for special attack. Certainly he has earned this distinction by his ability and intrepidity. When called to the episcopate he found the Church of England threatened by two deadly perils.

(1) An insidious Romanizing propaganda astutely and vigorously carried on within the ranks of the English Church, and in an effective manner as to threaten her disruption and possibly even her dissolution. Conscious of his responsibilities as a Bishop of a Reformed and National Church, Dr. Barnes set himself to check this fatal movement, and happily not without considerable measure of success. To crush it and expel it, without greatly increased resources, was out of the question.

(2) The second peril threatening the Church of England, though as deadly, was even harder to deal with, because it entailed a prolonged fight in the dark in which friends were found to be mistaken for foes, and foes for friends. The traditional theology, inherited by the Church of England, although formed in the sixteenth century, yet owing to the great advances in knowledge since that date and the consequent changed conception of the Universe and human history and the method of Divine Revelation, had become out of date. It had lost its power to grip and convince the modern educated mind, consequently a notable and largely silent desertion from the Church had set in. Although the traditional theology was feeble and discredited, yet it was apparent to discerning eyes that this was

due to its form, not to its essence, which had not lost its value nor even its power to attract if presented in a form in harmony with our modern knowledge and ways of thinking. As ancient church-bells which had become cracked and discordant and require to be taken down, re-cast, and re-hung, if they are to attract the faithful to their place of Christian worship, so the Church's traditional dogmas and their liturgical expressions demanded similar treatment. There was plenty of good metal for the bells, and plenty of local skill to ring them; all they needed and yet it was not little, was to be re-cast and re-hung. When he was consecrated to the See of Birmingham, Dr. Barnes found the English Liberal or Modernist school strenuously engaged in this somewhat difficult and dangerous operation. The Bishop was quick to recognize both its necessity, and its merits, and used his great position and powers to assist in the task. More than a less courageous bishop, realizing that any aspersions on the orthodoxy might prove as deadly in their effect as aspersions on the courage of a soldier, would have faltered and failed, but Dr. Barnes, realizing that he had 'come to the kingdom for such time as this,' sought every occasion to use the pulpit as an opportunity for expounding Christian truth in the light of modern knowledge. Whilst there has been no lack of thoroughness and lucidity in his Modernist teaching, yet it has been characterized as his volume *Should such a Faith Offend?* demonstrates reverence, positiveness, and practicality.

The Bishop has clearly recognized that what the great majority of English Churchmen desire in religious teaching to-day is not tradition, but truth. Whether the Church of the fourth or sixteenth century said a certain thing in a certain way matters nothing to them; what they wish to know is, what in the face of modern doubts and modern difficulties, after thorough and impartial investigation, is the conviction of their would-be Christian teacher? Dr. Barnes has grasped the character of this demand and the need for meeting it, and with such success, whether he be delivering the Gifford Lectures in a Scottish University, or be preaching sermons in an English cathedral, that crowded audiences listen with eager attention and depart with the conviction that they have heard an able and honest man who has said something well worth saying.

It is the Bishop's practical recognition of his duty in these important spheres, and his brave and zealous efforts to do it, which have made him the object of the most bitter attack on the part of mediaevalists and obscurantists. That their attack will not succeed in bringing into clearer and stronger light the truth which they fear, we have no shadow of doubt whatsoever.

The other aspect of this attack on Dr. Barnes may be dismissed with the words of the poet's protest addressed to the ass which brayed during his afternoon nap :

‘Your strident and unseemly noise
Our quiet-loving soul annoys.’

CHURCH PATRONAGE REFORM.

Churchmen who have studied the proposed Church Patronage Measure will be devoutly thankful for the drastic handling which it has received from the Committee of the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation. The Committee have recommended a new measure, and very wisely remark that

‘The immediate task before the Church to-day is not to devise a new and ideal system of appointment to benefices, but to readjust the existing system of patronage, which is as old as the Church of England itself, in order that the maximum of efficiency may be obtained under modern conditions.’

The Committee shrewdly suggest that the varying needs of parishes will probably be better studied by deepening the sense of responsibility among patrons of all types, rather than by attempting to lay down ideal conditions of presentation. Full and free consultation between patron and congregation is the essential and necessary condition for the removal of the deep dissatisfaction which exists in many parishes.

Of the principles enunciated by the Committee, the following appear to us to be of prime importance :—

(1) Nothing in the method of selection should be allowed which might detract from the independence and self-respect of the parish priest.

(2) The patron's privilege of presentation should remain in its original nature of a public trust for the particular locality of the parish. This demands that the patron shall acquaint himself with the conditions of the parish, and consider the wishes of the parishioners.

The problem of course is how to harmonize in beneficial operation the rights of the parishioners (which to-day are hardly recognized) and the rights of the patron. There are, it is true, the supervisory rights of the Bishop, but these, as they exist at present, seem happily to require neither diminution nor extension.

We venture to suggest that this harmonization of rights would be best secured by the setting up of Parish Patronage Boards consisting of five members: two elected by the Diocese, two elected by the parish, with the patron or his representative as chairman.

The chairman to be the sole convener of the Board is to have the sole right to propose for election the name of a clerk to fill the vacant benefice. The chairman, while having no right to vote for his nominee in the first instance, would, if the votes were equal, have the casting vote: the clerk so elected to be presented to the Bishop for institution. Should the Bishop decline to institute, he must give his reasons in writing both to the patron and to the clerk. If no nomination be made to the Bishop by the Patronage Board within six months from the close of vacancy, the patronage for that turn shall lapse to the Bishop.

We should certainly recommend that the two parochial nominators on the parish Patronage Board be elected by the parishioners at their annual parochial meeting. The two Diocesan nominators on the Patronage Board to be elected by the Diocesan Conference. It would probably be best that there should be a separate set of Diocesan nominators for each rural deanery, or at least for each archdeaconry.

Lord Hugh Cecil has said that the reform of Church Patronage is next to Prayer Book Revision the most important matter before the Church. Most active laymen will agree with his view.

EPISCOPAL CRITICISM OF PUBLIC SCHOOL RELIGION.

Bishop Headlam, who on various occasions has rightly pointed to the serious reduction in the total of Public School ordinands as indicating that the cost of preparation for the Ministry is not, in a number of important cases, the true cause of young men not being ordained, has now stated publicly with

regards as the real reason for this falling off in the Public School contribution to the ranks of the clergy. Put briefly, it is due to the Public Schools having lay-headmasters instead of clerics. Behind that statement lies the unanswered question: Why have laymen replaced clergymen in the headmasterships of the Public Schools?

The Bishop's statement, which runs as follows, appears in the *Gloucester Diocesan Magazine* for January, 1930:

'It is asked why the results from Public Schools are unsatisfactory. It is because, although they are Institutions connected with the Church, they are now almost entirely under Lay Headmastership, and the religious teaching has been in many cases of a character not likely to influence boys. Many of the teachers have not had any real training in the subject they have taught. I can remember many Form Masters who looked upon the Greek Testament lesson as an admirable opportunity of teaching the parsing of Greek verbs. I enjoyed the advantage of two admirable teachers, who really cared for their subject, and whose influence was profound, but many teachers were quite inadequate. The influence of Public Schools varies from time to time, but in many cases the religious instruction is of a most unsatisfactory character. A Public School boy goes into the world without ever having been properly taught what he should believe, or what he should do, or the meaning of his position as a member of the Church of England, and he is at the mercy of any variety of teaching—positive or negative—he may come in contact with.'

We should have been glad to know what is Dr. Headlam's evidence for this indictment of the religious training given by the Public Schools and the laicity of the headmasters being the cause of the decline in its quality. The older clerical headmasters were certainly not the sort of people to trifle with incipient infidelity. S. T. Coleridge's clerical headmaster threatened a flogging which entirely cured its victim of atheism, and Coleridge was remarkably grateful to his headmaster for his prompt action. Many of these clerical headmasters were staunch Churchmen of the Parson Thwackum breed, whose declaration of churchmanship ought never to be forgotten in these dangerous times:

'When I say Religion, I mean the Christian Religion, and when I say the Christian Religion I mean the Protestant Religion, and when I say the Protestant Religion I mean the Church of England.'

But neither these methods nor expositions meet the needs of the Modern Public School boy. The teaching of the Christian Religion to the young to-day, and the teaching of it in such a way as

to make them loyal members of the Church of England, is a matter of extreme difficulty. The clerical headmasters live from that point of view, in easier and happier times.

Although it may be admitted that there is room for improvement, and that is always the case in mundane affairs, there are many indications that the Public Schools are grappling seriously, and in some measure successfully, with the difficulties of the religious training of their scholars. They are trying to teach them the truth about the Bible and also to value the Bible: they teach them also the value of public worship and prepare them for Confirmation with conscientious carefulness: above all they strive to develop the Christian character of their boys not simply on the personal side, but also on the social side.

We do not regard attendance at Holy Communion as a necessary indication of the success of religious training, but we believe that we are justified in saying that in no congregation does one see so large a proportion of devout communicants as in the Public Schools—and of course the attendance at Holy Communion there is entirely voluntary.

It is quite impossible here to do more than touch upon Public School religion very slightly, but those who will read the three chapters devoted to Religion in Dr. Norwood's recently published volume, *The English Tradition of the Public Schools*, will see what a great part religion plays in our Public Schools in the estimation of the Headmaster of Harrow, yet another of the lay headmasters who has replaced a clergyman. We may only give two citations, but they are not without interest in the light of Bishop Headlam's contention. Dr. Norwood, speaking of the extreme importance of the sermon in the school chapel proceeds:

'That thought raises the incidental question whether Headmasters should be laymen, or in Holy Orders. I have heard it said by one Bishop that a reason for the shortage of candidates for the ministry of the Church was that so many schoolmasters were in Orders, and the boys study them, and say, "At any rate I am not going to be a half-timer like him." I have also heard it said by another Bishop that a reason for the same shortage is that so many Headmasters are laymen for as soon as the boys see a layman enter the pulpit, they say, "Well at any rate the Sacraments don't matter." Whatever, therefore, a schoolmaster may do, he will not escape all episcopal censure' (p. 29)

* Published by John Murray, price 10/6 (1929).

We are disposed to conclude that one reason for the little interest which the Public School boy seems to take in Church attendance after he leaves his school, is that he finds the level of services and sermons in the parish churches so much below what he has become accustomed to in his school chapel. Our second quotation from Dr. Norwood's book deserves serious attention :

'One of the difficulties of school religion, though it is not confined to schools, and does greater mischief outside the schools than in them, is the contempt that has been poured on Mattins by one party in the Church. The assumption, implicit with some, but expressed by others, is that if you attend a Choral Eucharist at 11 a.m., your religion is real and vital, but if you attend Mattins at the same time, it is conventional and unmeaning' (p. 26).

The services and religious teaching of the Public Schools, with few exceptions, are essentially English in their tone and character. Many of the parish churches are becoming un-English, and their clergy seem, both in their religion and their mentality, to have less and less in common with the educated laity. We have no desire to stress this, but we believe it has much more to do with the Public School boy losing interest in his Church, than has the fact that his headmaster was a layman.

THE LITURGICAL MAZE AND THE CLUE.

Dr. Bell, whom Churchmen of all schools were glad to see raised to the episcopate, has just issued his first New Year's episcopal message in the *Chichester Diocesan Gazette*. He puts the liturgical issue in the forefront of his message :

'One great issue which the Church of England has to face in the coming months is its own proper spiritual freedom.'

According to Dr. Bell, this would mean, so it seems to us, the right of the Church of England as by law established, to use services which Parliament has not authorized, and even has declined to authorize. Of course the Church has the right to worship God publicly as she thinks best, but her bishops and clergy may only, in accordance with their undertakings, use the Prayer Book services in public worship, with special services authorized for special occasions. Although many unauthorized changes have been made in the services of late years, such as the use of hymns, the bulk of these changes have been loyal to the spirit of the English Church and have been valued, not resented,

by the laity. Another class of innovations introduced deliberately for the purpose of approximating our English services to those of Rome has created great irritation and opposition among the laity, and they have appealed again and again to the bishops to check this Romanizing movement, but for the most part in vain.

What the laity are interested in, in so far as they are interested at all, is not the assertion of the right of the Church to worship God in the way she thinks best. This claim, which Mrs. Hemans believed, took the Pilgrim Fathers to New England, no body questions to-day; what the average layman cannot understand in this connection is why some of the Bishops desire to fight Parliament for the right to authorize services which the bulk of the laity do not want. When the laity are told that the Bishops desire this in order to control the recalcitrant Romanizing clergy, they distrust the policy, for they think some of the Bishops are in league with the recalcitrants or else they would have checked them long ago. For the most part the laity believe in the omnipotence of the Bishop as simple people before the war believed in the Omnipotence of Deity—that he can do just what he likes. What the helpless and disgruntled laity desire in hundreds, if not in thousands, of parish churches is that the Bishops should abolish the Romanizing changes. They feel that this is the duty of the Bishops, and that they are neglecting it. It was this feeling which caused the rejection of the Deposited Book. That is how the bulk of the laity see the liturgical question: they care nothing about ‘spiritual freedom’: they want their liturgical rights, and they know that they are being defrauded of them.

The pressing need then is not that the Bishops should quixotically fight Parliament for ‘spiritual freedom,’ but that they should suppress Romanizing recalcitrants in the parishes—a more difficult and not less heroic enterprise. ‘Do the work that’s nearest, though it’s dull at times,’ was the advice of an heroic English clergyman. Those who declare war abroad in order to secure popularity at home may be skilful politicians, but they are not sound statesmen.

Dr. Bell, however, sees the necessity of securing liturgical order, and makes the following suggestions with regard to it:

‘For my part, I believe that if we, in the Church of England, would only make it plain that we do not wish to rest upon the arm of the State for the enforcement of obedience or the punishment of disobedience, but that we prefer to proceed in matters of worship and faith by mutual consent, without recourse to statutory courts, then there is no reason why we should not now by our own voluntary procedure, through our own synodical processes, first in the province and then in the diocese, decree and do those things which seem good to the Church.’

Is not this a counsel of perfection? Have not the Bishops refused to prosecute for years past? Have they not refrained from securing any alteration in the law which would make prosecution more simple and more effective? What has the result been? Romanizing has increased steadily. You cannot placate the Dean of St. Paul’s by stroking the dome. The recalcitrants are not criminals or cowards. They are men of consistency and courage. Their principles prohibit their yielding to episcopal appeals. We have no doubt many of them would like to do so. It would make life easier and relations more pleasant, but they may not do it. The authority of the Bishop and his synod, the authority even of the Primate and his provincial council, are not supreme for these clergymen. Above them all stands the liturgical law of the Catholic Church, which really means in practice the Roman Catholic Church. It is to this they appeal, and before this they stand. They may be boycotted, put to the ban, but they will not yield. They can afford to possess their souls in patience. They know that in the more numerous seminaries of the Church their liturgical principles are being taught; they know that the day will come when the clerical majority in the synod will vote in their favour, then their Bishop, and at a later stage their Archbishop, will yield belated obedience to the laws of the Catholic *cultus*—that *cultus* which was replaced by the Reformed *cultus* at the Reformation.

Is this statement exaggerated? We believe it is not. Did Father Dolling yield to Bishop Davidson of Winchester? He preferred professional ruin rather than yield. We doubt if a single outstanding member of this group has yielded. Should these men yield, we should be as surprised as was the Greek world when the Spartans surrendered at Sphacteria. *La garde meurt mais elle ne se rend pas.*

We admire these men, although their principles are not ours. We hold the principles of the Reformation, which were born

when ecclesiastical imperialism was shattered by national idealism. We are convinced that National Churches have the right to determine their own laws of public worship, so they be not contrary to Christian principles, and to insist on their observance by the clergy of the National Church. Being modern Churchmen, and not Tudor Churchmen, we do not hold that it is permissible to fine and imprison the recalcitrants, but we do hold that it is right after persuasion, warning, and admonition to suspend and finally to deprive them. Of course we view this as a last resource, and a very unhappy one.

Charges of recalcitrance should certainly first be tried in an ecclesiastical court and the sentence delivered by an ecclesiastical judge. Should, however, an appeal be made to the civil court, then as one said to the Apostle of the Gentiles when he appealed from the Sanhedrin to the Roman Emperor: 'Thou hast appealed unto Caesar, unto Caesar shalt thou go.' The ecclesiastical authority suffers no loss by such an appeal. Reason and conscience determine the decisions of these civil courts. Each litigant feels secure of justice. As the Sovereign is supreme over all causes, both ecclesiastical and civil, the final appeal is made to him, and decided by his Privy Council. The litigant Churchman bows before the decision and accepts it as decisive so far as this world is concerned, for the Sovereign according to the teaching of Scripture is the Divine Vicegerent. There is no appeal from him save to the High Court of Heaven. That is we believe the right interpretation of the procedure, and the procedure appears to us to be a quite admirable one provided that all judges, whether ecclesiastical or civil, realize the immense responsibility of their functions, and are adequately trained and disciplined in the due exercise of their judicial duties, and provided also that the law they administer reflects the highest level of the moral and rational consciousness reached by their community. When we contrast this procedure with that which history records of the administration of justice by ecclesiastical assemblies as deficient in legal training as they are in judicial impartiality, we exclaim in the spirit of Madame Roland, not 'O Liberty,' but 'O Christ! what evils are wrought in thy name.'

Our main difficulty at the present time is that we have an unworkable law which leads to the imprisonment of the recalcitrant clergy. This is a most improper form of punishment, and as a consequence the Bishops decline to prosecute or to permit prosecution. What is required is to amend the law so as to make the penalty, in the last resort, deprivation. We understand that the Bishops do not want to amend the law, because they do not want to prosecute. Of course they don't. Who does? It is a horrid thing to have to prosecute, but are not the substitutes for it even more objectionable? It seems to us a more repellent thing for a bishop to have to boycott a congregation because of the liturgical recalcitrance of its priest. If the parish of a recalcitrant priest may not be entered by its bishop, it seems to us far better to deprive the priest. Curates are sent flying for recalcitrance, and no fuss made about it. Why should incumbents be so much considered?

There is of course another remedy. It is to amend our liturgical laws so as to allow our Romanizing clergy to practise their Romanizing legally. How much amendment would be required? Would they be satisfied with the Communion Service of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI? If they would, they should have it at once. We desired years ago that it should be granted to them. We know, however, to-day, that they would not be satisfied with it. They desire the whole Roman *cultus*. Now the practical point is this. There is no room in this country for two Churches alike in doctrine and *cultus*, the one in communion with the Pope, and the other which would like to be in communion with him, but dare not. For the Church of England, Reformed and by law Established, there is great need in this country, but for a denationalized Church which is a feeble, sectarian imitation of the Church of Rome there is no need at all. No one will trouble to eat chalk when he can get cheese.

AN AMERICAN KIKUYU.

The New York Conference of the Christian Unity League, held November 13th—15th at St. George's Episcopal Church, New York (of which Dr. Karl Reiland is rector), decided to close the Conference proceedings with a united service of Holy Com-

munion in St. George's Church. Dr. Coffin, a Presbyterian minister, the President of the Union Theological Seminary, was invited to celebrate. Dr. Manning, Bishop of New York, on the day before the Conference assembled, forbade the celebration in St. George's Church. It took place elsewhere.

The Bishop's prohibition came as a great surprise to many people, as the Bishop not so long ago, when soliciting subscriptions from members of all denominations towards the cost of building his great cathedral, declared that it was to be 'for all people.'

Much discussion has followed in the press. The following comment by the *Christian Leader* is eminently judicious :

'It will not promote Christian Unity for those of us who are not Episcopalians to use harsh words about Bishop Manning. The Episcopal rectors in attendance at the meeting in New York, some of them strong men in the Diocese of New York, handle Bishop Manning without gloves. The Bishop is living up to the best light he has. To us it is a dim, murky light and the action as narrow as any we have read about in recent years. But when we think about it let us remember the great multitude of liberal Episcopalians who view this action with "mortification and regret."'

If America leads Creation, England is never far behind. The Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Woods), on his recent return from America, forbade a United Communion Service with Free Churchmen which it was proposed to hold at Eastleigh, Hants, similar to one held last year on the occasion of the Evangelical Alliance United Week of Prayer.

The Vicar of Eastleigh, the Rev. E. G. Wells, felt bound to yield to the Bishop's prohibition, and has refrained from handling him without gloves. He writes in his *Parish Magazine* :

'I am quite convinced that the effect of such an act of fellowship between members of different denominations is to break down prejudices and to stir up in many hearts a vision of the possibilities of reunion.'

If, as many Churchmen feel, we had best proceed to reunion by means of united Communion Services, it is clear that it will be needful to form a league for that purpose. It would, however, be most inadvisable for anything to be done in that direction before the next Lambeth Conference.

Dr. Reiland and Mr. Wells are both members of the Modern Churchmen's Union.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERNISM IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By the Reverend G. L. H. HARVEY, M.A., Vicar of Earley, Reading.

IT is not easy to define Modernism. Modernism is a spirit, an attitude of mind, and, as such, it may be positively misleading to attempt to imprison it within the limitations of a rigid definition. It takes many forms. In our own day in the Church of England its influence has affected the theology of Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic alike, and many who would repudiate the name of Modernist have been unwittingly influenced by the spirit of Modernism. Whatever else Modernism may be, it is certain that it is not modern. Jeremiah was a Modernist when, as against the traditionalist view of divine judgment summed up in the proverb, 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are on edge,' he asserted that 'the soul that sinneth it shall die' (*Jer.* 31, 29, cf. *Ezek.* 18, 2). Job was a Modernist when he challenged the popular belief that reward is proportioned to desert. The author of the Fourth Gospel was the great Modernist of the infant Church when, using the categories of Greek thought, he envisaged Jesus as the Logos and thereby sowed a seed which bore rich fruit in Christian theology. The Scholastic theology was the Modernism of the Middle Ages. Modernism attempts to express religion in terms of the best thought and knowledge of the age. The Modernist of to-day refuses to keep his religion isolated from modern thought and knowledge, and accepts gratefully and whole-heartedly the discoveries of the scientist and the critical methods of the historian.

The Church of England provides a congenial home for Modernism. A German observer, examining the *ethos* of the Church of England from a detached position, has recently described its distinguishing mark as humanism. Before the breach with Rome, Archbishop Warham offered Erasmus a benefice in England, and Hooker, who expresses better than any other the divine spirit of the reformed Church of England, lays strong stress on the appeal to reason. Dean Inge in his Hulsean Lectures, *The Platonic Tradition in English Religious Thought*,

has drawn attention to the liberalism associated with the names of Falkland, Hales, Chillingworth, and Stillingfleet, and has painted a charming picture of another group which has affinity with the Modernism of to-day, the Cambridge Platonists. Some of his quotations from Whichcote and John Smith would serve well as mottoes for a Modernist. 'A man cannot be at peace with himself while he lives in disobedience to known truth,' says Whichcote, and again, 'He that gives reason for what he saith has done what is fit to be done and the most that can be done. He that gives no reason speaks nothing, though he saith never so much.' In the eighteenth century came a reaction against the theological strife of the seventeenth century. Men had no desire for a revival of conflicts which they associated with revolution and civil war. The Church of England during the eighteenth century exalted the virtue of tolerance; its ideals were comprehension and benevolence. Interest in theology was widespread and the legitimacy of the appeal to reason was generally accepted. 'The defect of the eighteenth century,' says Mark Pattison, 'was not in having too much good sense, but in having nothing besides.' Even so, the hard common-sense of the men of the eighteenth century fulfilled a useful function. It definitely established the principle of toleration, and in its bracing attack on theology was prevented from becoming 'an unmeaning frost-work of dogma, out of all relation to the actual history of man.'

The decorum of the eighteenth century was sadly disturbed by the descent of a mighty wind from heaven in the form of the great Evangelical revival. Of the Evangelicals Canon Storr says, 'They were not theologians; they were religious reformers. Truth for truth's sake, the independent pursuit of truth, was no passion with them . . . Art, science, literature, philosophy, with all the contributions to the fullness of human life, were viewed by them with indifference or hostility.'¹ 'For them the Bible was not simply the record of a divine revelation. The very page was sacred. It was not only the word, it was the words of God.'² The appeal of Evangelicalism was to the will and the emotions alone. Therein lay its strength and therein was concealed its ultimate weakness. Though the Evangelical revival

¹ *The Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 70.

² *Ib.*, p. 69.

left on Anglicanism a permanent impress, by the time of the rise of the Tractarian Movement it had lost its first energy and force of appeal. Tractarianism, though differing profoundly from Evangelicalism, was inspired by the same high seriousness, the same deep consciousness of the reality of the world invisible. It unfortunately resembled Evangelicalism in another respect—its alienation from the wider thought and culture of its day. It was definitely a reactionary movement. Mark Pattison, who was at Oriel before and during its rise and was himself for a time drawn into its vortex, thus describes its character as reflected in the life of the College which gave it birth :

‘ It has often occurred to me to compare what took place at this period in the fortunes of a small college with the course of things in the great movement of the sixteenth century. About 1500 it seemed as if Europe was about to cast off at one effort the slough of feudal barbarism and to step at once into the fair inheritance of the wisdom and culture of the ancient world. The Church led the van, and smiled on free enquiry and the new learning. About the third decennium of the century the resistance of the *obscurantists* was organised, the Catholic reaction set in, and nascent humanism was submerged beneath the tide of theological passion and the fatal and fruitless controversies of Lutheran, Calvinist and Catholic to the rival cries of the Bible and the Church. The *sacrificio d'intelletto* of Loyola took the place of the free and rationalising spirit with which Erasmus had looked out upon the world of men. It was soon after 1830 that the ‘ Tracts ’ desolated Oxford life, and suspended, for an indefinite period, all science, humane letters and the first strivings of intellectual freedom which had moved in the bosom of Oriel.’³

sacrifice of the intellect is the form of sacrifice which the average man will most readily make, but to the best laymen of the great flowering period of the Victorian Age it was the last treachery, the one unpardonable sin. Hence the widening gulf of the middle years of the last century between the ecclesiastical mind and the world of scientific thought. This was given dramatic expression in the clash between Bishop Wilberforce and Huxley at the Oxford meeting of the British Association in 1860. According to the account of an eye-witness Wilberforce, after speaking for half an hour ‘ with inimitable spirit, emptiness, and unfairness,’ had the impertinence to ask Huxley whether he was related on his grandfather’s or grandmother’s side to an ape, whereupon Huxley replied that ‘ if there were an ancestor whom I should feel shame in recalling, it would be a *man*, a man of

³ Mark Pattison, *Memoirs*, pp. 100-101.

restless and versatile intellect, who, not content with an equivocal success in his own sphere of activity, plunges into scientific questions with which he has no real acquaintance, only obscures them by an aimless rhetoric, and distract the attention of his hearers from the real point at issue by eloquent digressions and skilled appeals to religious prejudice.'⁴ But throughout the period of reaction there still persisted a current of ecclesiastical thought in line with the humanist tradition. This was represented by the Noetic group of which the intellectual father was Edward Copleston, Provost of Oriel (1814—1828) and later Bishop of Llandaff. Some of its members were still alive and active in 1860 when *Essays and Reviews* was published.

It is from the publication of *Essays and Reviews* that we may date the rise in its present form of the movement now known as Modernism. The book was a manifesto and a challenge. Though the various contributors wrote 'in entire independence of each other,' they were animated by a common purpose, 'attempt to illustrate the advantage derivable to the cause of religious and moral truth, from a free handling, in a becoming spirit, of subjects peculiarly liable to suffer by the repetition of conventional language, and from traditional methods of treatment.' In a letter to the Bishop of London the writer of the first essay, Dr. Temple, then Headmaster of Rugby, said:

'I for one joined in writing this book in the hope of breaking through that mischievous reticence which, go where I would, I perpetually found destroying the truthfulness of religion. I wished to encourage men to speak out.'⁵

Much of what these pioneers of seventy years ago wrote seems even to-day singularly modern. The following quotations are culled almost haphazard:

'The time will come when educated men will be no more able to believe that the words "Out of Egypt have I called my son" (*Matt.* II, 15, *Hosea* XI, 1) were intended by the prophet to refer to the return of Joseph and Mary from Egypt, than they are now able to believe the Roman Catholic explanation of *Gen.* III, 15, "*Ipsa conteret caput tuum*," . . . the incarnification of the divine Immanuel remains although the angelic appearances which herald it in the narratives of the Evangelists may be of ideal origin according to the conceptions of former days. 'We cannot encourage a remorseless criticism of German tile histories and escape its contagion when we approach Hebrew annals.'

⁴ *Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. II, p. 322.

⁵ *Life of Archbishop Tait*, Vol. I, p. 292.

The challenge of the Essayists was speedily taken up by Bishop Wilberforce of Oxford, first in an Episcopal Charge and then in a bitter article in the *Quarterly Review*. He himself had no hesitation as to what constituted orthodoxy. If men were persuaded to 'accept allegorically, or as parable, or poetry, or legend, the story of a serpent tempter, of an ass speaking with man's voice, of an arresting of the earth's motion, or of a reversal of its motion,' they were in danger of being 'robbed unawares of the very foundations of the Faith.'⁶ Looking back it is clear that it was the dominance of ecclesiastics like Wilberforce which, by alienating the educated lay mind, constituted the real danger to the Church. Unfortunately such men were allowed by their wiser colleagues to shout their opinions from the housetops unrebuked. As Temple protested to the Bishop of London :

'What can be a grosser superstition than the theory of literal inspiration? But because that has a regular footing it is to be treated as a good man's mistake, while the courage to speak the truth about the first chapter of the Book of Genesis is a wanton piece of wickedness.'⁷

While Wilberforce used his great position and brilliant controversial gifts to stir up popular prejudice against the Essayists, another Tractarian leader, the pugnacious Archdeacon Denison, set to work with characteristic energy to secure their condemnation by Convocation. His efforts were crowned with success in 1864. Fairness and justice have never been conspicuous ecclesiastical virtues. The methods of Denison were positively indecent. His ideal was that the accuser should as judge pronounce sentence. 'The man who moves for the Committee,' he wrote, 'is the proper Chairman of it, because it is reasonable to assume that he has most fully considered the matter in hand before he moves, and is therefore in the best position to put into shape the substance of what, in his view of the case, has to be said about it.'⁸ He also thought that 'the Chairman should be ready with a draft Report upon the first day of the assembling of the Committee'! Of the final debate in Convocation he wrote, 'I remember well that upon the first day of the three days' debate, I had to telegraph to twenty men to come up to vote. Fifteen came to my call, and that gave me the majority of twenty in a house of not more than sixty members—39 to 19.'⁹

⁶ *Ib.*, p. 279.

⁸ G. A. Denison, *Notes of my Life*, p. 292.

⁷ *Ib.*, p. 292.

⁹ *Ib.*, p. 294.

Fortunately, in the Church of England, the theologian accused of heresy has in his right of appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council a shield against the fury of *odium theologicum*. He is not guilty of heresy unless he has used language which is clearly inconsistent with the formularies of his Church, a point on which the great lawyers who sit on the Judicial Committee are by training and ability pre-eminently fitted to pronounce a decision. Referring to this tribunal, Bishop Thirlwall, perhaps the wisest of the bishops who adorned the bench during the nineteenth century, considered it as 'a ground for the deepest thankfulness, as one of the most precious privileges of the Church of England, that principles which I believe to be grounded in justice, equity, and common-sense, are still the rule of judgment in ecclesiastical causes.'¹⁰ Two of the Essayists, Williams and Wilson, were formally charged with heresy on the ground that they denied the Inspiration of Holy Scripture. Wilson was also accused of denying the eternity of future punishment. In the Court of Arches they were found guilty and sentenced to a year's suspension, but on appeal to the Judicial Committee they were acquitted. The uproar which followed was deafening. Pusey and his Tractarian followers joined hands with the Evangelicals in issuing a manifesto in which within a few weeks they obtained the signatures of 11,000 clergymen. In this document they laid it down that the whole canonical Scriptures are inspired not only as containing but being the Word of God, and that belief that the punishment of Hell is everlasting is an essential part of Christian faith. The heresy hunt led by Wilberforce, Denison, and Pusey, is important not only in itself, but because it is the classical model to which later efforts have closely conformed.

The protest of the Early Fathers of Modernism against the doctrine of everlasting punishment is characteristic of the strong ethical colouring which has marked Modernism throughout all stages of its development. This element in Modernism has in our own day been nobly expressed in the writings of Dean Rashdall, who was not only a pillar of Modernism, but also a great Churchman, and a scholar of massive learning. Especially do we find it in his protest against unethical substitutionary theories.

¹⁰ *Remains Literary and Theological of Connor Thirlwall*, Vol. II, 138.

of the Atonement. Ten years before the *Essays and Reviews* controversy another precursor of Modernism, F. D. Maurice, had been deprived by administrative action of his Chairs at King's College for casting doubt on the doctrine of everlasting punishment.

'I know,' he wrote, 'that we may struggle with the Light, that we may choose death. But I know also that Love does overcome this rebellion. I know that I am bound to believe that its power is greater than every other. I am sure that death, hell, hatred, are not so strong as their opposites. How can I reconcile these contradictory discoveries? I cannot reconcile them. I can find no theory which can. But I can trust in Him who has reconciled the world to Himself. I can leave all in His hands.'¹¹

After the acquittal of Williams and Wilson, Dean Stanley invited Liddon to preach one of a course of sermons in Westminster Abbey by men representative of every shade of opinion in the Church of England including that embodied in *Essays and Reviews*. On the ground that acceptance would be a public act of fellowship 'with men like Mr. Maurice,' etc., Liddon refused, and when Stanley in his reply referred to 'a man so holy and self-devoted as Frederick Maurice' he retorted that no doubt he is a rebuke to most of us who hold truths which he denies. Tyre and Sidon have always a lesson for Chorazin and Bethsaida.'¹²

Chorazin and Bethsaida were further disturbed in the sixties by the adventures of Bishop Colenso in the field of Old Testament criticism. His mathematical examination of Pentateuchal statistics seems reasonable enough and his conclusions in this sphere irresistible, but even the multiplication table was a fence which the heresy-hunters had no difficulty in taking in their stride. Inevitably such stubborn obscurantism was doomed to fight a losing battle. Writing in 1878 Archdeacon Denison said, 'I am constrained to repeat my belief here, that if I had had to deal with *Essays and Reviews*, and with the book of Dr. Colenso at this time, and with proceedings against him personally as a heretic instead of some eighteen years ago, I could not carry the condemnation through the Lower House: I need say nothing of the prospect of it in the Upper House.'¹³

A clear sign of the defeat of rigid conservatism was the ap-

¹¹ *Life of Frederick Denison Maurice*, Vol. II, p. 19.

¹² *Life and Letters of Henry Parry Liddon*, p. 74.

¹³ G. A. Denison, *Notes on my Life*, p. 325.

pearance in 1889 of *Lux Mundi*, under the editorship of the Reverend Charles Gore. The editor frankly expressed his view that our Lord's human knowledge was limited. 'Our Lord Himself never exhibits the omniscience of bare Godhead in the realm of natural knowledge, such as would be required to anticipate the results of modern science or criticism.' He was in principle prepared to accept the methods of historical criticism as applicable to the whole Bible, but, along with the other contributors, he was very conservative in his attitude to the writings of the New Testament. Dr. Liddon, at that time the leading representative of theological conservatism, had no doubt at all as to what was involved in the critical principles conceded in *Lux Mundi*.

'I have been more distressed than I can say,' he wrote, 'by the concluding pages of Gore's Essay, which have come upon me as a thunderbolt out of a clear sky. It is practically a capitulation at the feet of the young Rationalist Professors, by which the main position which the old Apologists of Holy Scripture have maintained are conceded to the enemy, in deference to the "literary" judgment of our time.'¹⁴

Liddon himself stood firm to the traditional Tractarian position.

'Is it not remarkable that our Divine Lord, as if in anticipation of the sceptical spirit of our day, sanctioned those portions of the Old Testament which was most strongly objected to by the modern Rationalists? The Flood, Lot's wife, Jonah in the whale, are all used by Him in His recorded teaching. Was He referring to fables which He knew, or—worse still—did not know to be such?'¹⁵

Archdeacon Denison in the year following the publication of *Lux Mundi* resumed his old rôle, attacking it in Convocation on the ground that it appealed from revelation to natural reason, from Christ to the wisdom of this world.

The next ten years were years of assimilation and consolidation. The conservative Modernism of *Lux Mundi* came to be widely accepted even in theological circles which prided themselves on their orthodoxy. It was not till the present century that it had become clear that it was impossible, while accepting the critical principles of *Lux Mundi*, to set a bar to their application at just that point at which its writers would wish to do so. In fact *Lux Mundi* has served as a bridge across which many have crossed from Traditionalism to a more pronounced form of Modernism. Dr. Gore would cry halt when criticism touched what he calls 'the historical events recited in the creeds.' He

¹⁴ *Life and Letters of Henry Parry Liddon*, p. 367.

¹⁵ *Ib.*, p. 361.

was prepared to jettison the miracles of the Old Testament, but was much more tender towards the miracles of the New Testament, and was adamant in demanding that the clergy at any rate should accept as historical facts that Jesus was born without human paternity and that His dead body was resuscitated after burial. It was not, in his judgment, enough to believe *ex animo* in the Incarnation and Resurrection. Belief in the Virgin Birth and a *physical* Resurrection were to be *de rigueur*.

In the year 1903 Dr. Gore, now a bishop, demanded and secured the resignation of one of his clergy who had in a magazine article questioned the historicity of the Virgin Birth. In the following year Dr. Henson, the present Bishop of Durham, published in the *Hibbert Journal* a very important article challenging the inviolability of the creeds from historical criticism.

'In so far, therefore,' he argued, 'as the Creeds are statements of fact, they are properly subject to the testing and, perhaps, the revision of historical criticism. In so far as they are definitions of doctrine, they have no direct connection with historical science, and must stand for judgment at another tribunal. . . . It seems to me that, with the application of historical criticism to the primitive Christian documents, much that has hitherto passed as fact may very probably be found undeserving of that description. It must be laid down as an axiom of discussion that the Creed can add nothing to the weight of the testimonies contained in the New Testament which are not only prior in point of time, but also are admittedly the basis upon which the affirmations of the Creed ultimately rest.'¹⁶

Is the faith of the Church in a Divine Christ, living, present, active, really "built on an empty tomb"? he asks. It would be difficult to find a clearer statement of the attitude of the Modernism of the twentieth century. In the same article Dr. Henson essayed the *rôle* of prophet, and, looking back over the twenty-five years which have elapsed, one is constrained to admit that events have so far justified his foresight. He held that there are inevitably

'Three stages to be passed through: first, the stage of holy horror, righteous indignation, unjust procedure, oppression of individuals. The next, the stage of uncertainty, half-confessed doubt, a troubled conscience, an aspect of general confusion over the whole area of Church teaching. Finally, a stage of dignified assurance, in which the tombs of the prophets are built, and a new Christian Apologetic is developed and energetically pressed.'¹⁷

The controversy from 1860 to 1890 was in the main concerned with the bearing of the sciences of geology and evolu-

¹⁶ *Hibbert Journal*, Vol. II, pp. 483, 484 (1904).

¹⁷ *Ib.*, p. 486.

tionary biology on the writings of the Old Testament. During the past thirty years controversy has largely turned on the historicity of the miraculous element in the New Testament. The Traditionalist charges the Modernist with holding philosophic presuppositions which prevent him from acknowledging the full force of the evidence for miracles. The Modernist replies that this is an evasion of the point at issue. What he wants is evidence, and he demands that for miraculous events which lie outside normal experience the evidence should be conclusive beyond cavil. Dr. Salmon, who, at the end of a long and honoured life, found that he must modify his conservative position, can hardly be accused of the possession of adverse philosophic presuppositions. In the Introduction to his posthumous book *The Human Element in the Gospels*, he holds that 'if we are comparing two accounts of the same occurrence, we cannot help judging on the same principles as would guide us if we were judging between two contemporary events,' and that therefore 'without having any desire to eliminate miracle from the story we may be led to account some things as non-miraculous which on a different system had been thought capable only of a supernatural interpretation.'¹⁸ Mr. P. Elmer More, the brilliant and learned defender of the Chalcedonian Christology, is definitely and even bitterly hostile to the philosophy of the German Biblical critics, and yet, purely on the evidence, he has no hesitation in rejecting the miracles of the Virgin Birth and the Physical Resurrection. Of the Virgin Birth he says:

'It is so demonstrably a late intrusion into the life of Jesus, so manifestly legendary in construction, and withal so unessential to the Christian faith, that it has been abandoned by the majority of unprejudiced scholars.'¹⁹

Of the Gospel account of our Lord's resurrection he writes:

'Commentators have made desperate efforts to harmonize the Gospels here, but again, as in the case of the virgin birth, have failed lamentably. And, apart from these inconsistencies, the narrative bears the unmistakable stamp of legendary invention.'²⁰

So long as the Modernist can point to such men as Professor Salmon and Mr. Elmer More he need not trouble himself unduly about the accusation that his attitude towards the miraculous elements in the Gospels proceeds from philosophical presuppositions.

¹⁸ *The Human Element in the Gospels*, p. 6.

¹⁹ *The Christ of the New Testament*, p. 267.

²⁰ *Ib.*, p. 270.

‘BIBLICAL MIDDLEMEN’

THE phrase was coined by the late Bishop Boyd Carpenter. ‘The Church is in grievous need of Biblical middlemen,’ he declared, and thus defined his use of the term: ‘Teachers who would stand between those engaged in critical research and the great body of the faithful who felt their salvation was somehow dependent on their reading *mumpsimus* for *sumpsimus*, and show them how helpful and illuminating many of the positive results of criticism are.’ ‘It is a task,’ he added, ‘which requires a remarkable combination of courage, cleverness, and caution.’

There can be no doubt that the Bishop’s words indicate one of the greatest needs of the Church to-day. When Prof. Peake’s now famous Commentary appeared, a reviewer in the *Spectator* described the situation precisely. ‘If this is what Biblical scholarship believes,’ said he, ‘it certainly is not what the average church member believes, and the sooner the gulf between the two is bridged the better for all concerned.’ That gulf is something of which every working minister is conscious. He is continually being reminded that the ‘new’ (save the mark!) knowledge of the Bible is not being assimilated, or only to a very slight extent, by his people. A Study Circle, a Teacher’s Preparation Class, casual remarks in pastoral visitation—all point in the same direction; while every succeeding newspaper ‘stunt’ on questions religious is an amazing revelation of how utterly unaware even well-informed people often are of truths which are the commonplaces of the student of the scriptures.

A recent re-reading of a book published some thirty years ago—Mr. R. E. Welsh’s *In Relief of Doubt*—has served to deepen and to give point to this impression. That excellent volume represented, at the time of its appearance, the general disposition of sane, reverent Biblical criticism. Perhaps, if anything, it was considered somewhat conservative even then. And yet, after thirty years, the position which it represents is by no means that of many—perhaps the majority—of the people who attend church. Here are truths which for a third of a century have been accepted by every scholar, and they have by no means percolated into the general consciousness of Christian people. And it is of no avail to urge the truism that the opinion of the

man in the street—or the man in the pew—is bound to be a generation or a couple of generations behind that of the experts, as far as any branch of learning is concerned. That does not meet the point. The trouble is that the gulf which was wide thirty years ago is not appreciably narrower to-day. There is little sign of any approximation between the leading teachers of the churches generally and those who compose our congregations. The purpose of this article is not to apportion blame for what is certainly a blameworthy state of affairs, but rather to plead for an earnest facing of the situation. And that is where the need of ‘Biblical middlemen’ comes in—teachers, in the pulpit and out of it, who can assist in mediating a better understanding between scholarship and ‘the great body of the faithful.’

The task of the Biblical middleman, as Bishop Boyd Carpenter says, is to show ‘how helpful and illuminating many of the positive results of criticism are.’ Helpful and illuminating; that is, not so much to the professor or preacher who regards the Bible more or less as a text-book, but to the unlearned who desire to find in it ‘the bread of life.’ Those who ‘replace simple reliance on the Bible by an intelligent and critical appreciation of its value,’ says Bishop Barnes in *Should Such a Faith Offend?* ‘claim that accurate study, so far from chilling devotion, strengthens faith in Christ.’ Such is the message which the Biblical middleman has to deliver. A difficult and delicate and exacting task it will almost certainly be, but it ought not to be an impossible one, now that an ever-increasing number are ready to testify that the removal of the incubus of literalism has made the Bible for them a new book.

‘Scholar after scholar,’ says one writer, ‘toiling with courage and patience, has enabled us to read these old records with an understanding, an appreciation, a keen and zestful enjoyment, such as could not be experienced by those who had always to defend or explain away obvious improbabilities, to ignore patent contradictions, and to treat as historical facts what are plainly legends and poetical traditions.’

Very similar is the testimony of the author of *Painted Windows* :

‘Modernism has fought and won the battle of verbal inspiration. No man whose opinion counts in the least degree now holds that the Bible was verbally inspired by God. It is respected, honoured, loved; but it is no longer a fetish. In ceasing to be a superstition, and in coming to be a number of genuine books full of light for the student of history, the Bible is exercising at the present time an extraordinary influence in the world, a greater influence perhaps on thoughtful minds than it ever before exercised.’

Such are testimonies which could be multiplied indefinitely among the comparative few who have honestly and intelligently faced the bugbear of 'higher criticism' and found it, not what they feared, but a positive means of grace. But the majority still allow *a priori* notions of its heinousness to rule their mind. The impression is still widespread that the only way to read the Bible for the good of one's soul is to read it in the Authorized Version, and as far away from the disturbing presence of the scholar as possible. An effective refutation of such a notion is Canon Deane's little volume, *How to Enjoy the Bible*, so marked by literary grace and devotional charm. Indeed, this admirable book may be described as a *vade mecum* for the Biblical middleman. It will indicate to him just what his task is, and—still more important—how he may best encompass it. And of course there are many other similar volumes, covering the same ground, and of equal merit and helpfulness. One of the latest of these popularizing efforts is *The Bible in the Light of To-day*, by the Enquiring Layman.¹

This recalls Bishop Boyd Carpenter's description of the necessary equipment for the Biblical middleman's task. It calls, he says, for 'a remarkable combination of courage, cleverness, and caution.' The words are well chosen, and the remainder of this paper will seek to bring out something of their significance.

The task calls for *courage*. Middlemen are not altogether in good repute nowadays. And when one compares the price of coal at the pit-head with its price on reaching our cellars, or reflects on the fact that, as someone has put it, eleven people get a bite out of an apple between the time it leaves the tree and its appearance on the table, they certainly appear to deserve a good deal of the opprobrium they get. The Biblical middleman, in like manner, will not escape wrath and contumely. It will be visited upon him in different forms. More kicks than compliments will probably be his portion. He may even become, in the language of the book he loves and whose interests he seeks to serve, 'a hissing and a reproach.' Who is this who dares to set out nought ancient landmarks? Who is this who undermines the foundations—unsettling the faith of the young and filching from the old their comfort and peace? In fact, the poor Biblical middleman will in many ways 'catch it' more than the professor

¹ Published by George Newnes (1929), price 2/6.

in his study or classroom. The latter is esconsed in the comparative safety of headquarters at the base; the former is in the front-line trenches.

This position in the front-line trenches certainly calls for courage. The Biblical middleman will have to assert unequivocally that the narrow nationalism, the parochial patriotism, which can so easily be defended by an uncritical use of the Old Testament, is, from the Christian standpoint, an anachronism. Some of the worst and most menacing features of a false patriotism may be supported—as they were during the war—by quoting Old Testament passages without reference to their context in the general development of the age-long purpose of God. There is, in this respect, as Bishop Henson points out in his *Church and Nation*, positive danger in our acquaintance with the Old Testament. The middleman's task in the modern world is to assert and guard against this danger. He must remember, and get others to grasp, the truth graphically expressed in Mr. Hubert L. Simpson's *Altars of Earth*:

'The Old Testament is indeed a lamp unto our feet; but we are children of the light, not slaves of the lamp . . . If you do not know how to hold and carry a lamp it will smoke most noisomely in your nostrils, it will make your eyes smart, it may blacken your face, it may even set your house on fire.'

So that the Biblical middleman will need all the courage he can muster, and must be prepared for many a hard word and not a little unhappiness. In fact, one is tempted to say that unless a man has a somewhat pachydermatous hide, or at any rate is blessed with that great gift of God, a sense of humour—of which primal necessity more anon—he had better avoid the thorny path of a Biblical middleman.

The task calls for *cleverness*. The word is not altogether a pleasant one in all its associations, but we may be sure it was not alliteration that suggested to the Bishop its use in this connection. Cleverness is indeed needed for the work of a Biblical middleman. And in the first place that cleverness which consists in a thorough acquaintance with sacred scholarship—at any rate in its broad lines—and in an intimate knowledge of the Bible itself. An ancient writer used to speak of the learning of its ministers as one of the sacraments of the Church, and that is scarcely an exaggeration. It is of vital importance that the Bibli-

cal middleman should have the 'cleverness' which will enable him to discriminate between the sound and sane conclusions of scholarship—'positive results,' in the Bishop's words—and the fanciful notions of irresponsible critics whose one criterion of the value of a theory appears to be its bizarre nature or the belief that it has never been thought of before.

Cleverness too in another sense of the word—the wisdom and understanding, good sense, which, joined with tactfulness, will lead to an unerring choice of procedure in any and every individual case. Not the cleverness of intellectual snobbery—hateful thing!—but the cleverness of intellectual sympathy. The cleverness so well described by the Second Isaiah in a beautiful passage: 'The Lord God hath given me the tongue of the learned, that I should know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary.' For we must recognize that weariness is the portion of many of our fellows to-day, spiritual weariness, largely arising from the vague notion, never really faced and therefore the more menacing, that somehow all is not well with the Bible. Once the sacred volume was to them the veritable word of God, and as such strengthened their heart and nourished their soul. It would be difficult to exaggerate the place which the Bible once held in the religion of Protestantism. It would be idle to deny that it holds that place no longer, and the reason for the change is that untenable ideas of the basis of Biblical authority, inevitably exploded by the growth of knowledge, have not been replaced by saner and truer views. The position is like that of a man who had been accustomed to eat, greatly to his bodily good, of a certain dish because he understood it contained vitamin A, but now declines it because the experts have proved that vitamin A is not in it at all. What has to be shown him is that the reason for partaking of the said food is not that it contains vitamin A, B, C or D, but that as a matter of experience it nourishes him. Such is the task of the Biblical middleman. 'We know that the Bible is inspired because it inspires.' And the cleverness required is that which can get folk to grasp that simple truth. It ought not to be a difficult thing to do, yet as a matter of fact it is.

Really, when one comes to think of it, the cleverness called for largely consists in a sense of humour. A sense of humour, Mr. Arnold Lunn assures us in his recent *John Wesley*, is a

fatal defect in a religious leader. That may be so; but it is valuable asset to one whose rôle is the humbler one of a Biblical middleman. There really are those, as Bishop Boyd Carpenter suggests—incredible as it may appear to some—who feel that their salvation is somehow dependent on their reading *mumpsimus* for *sumpsimus*. They must be treated tenderly, no doubt; but sometimes the solvent of a gentle humour will prove the most effective prescription. Space forbids to develop this point in detail, and indeed there is no need. The Biblical middleman who is blessed with a sense of humour will easily find occasion for its kindly use. And he who is not thus armed had better keep out of the contest altogether.

Thirdly, the task calls for *caution*. Carefulness in the presentation of unfamiliar truth will always mark the Biblical middleman who is not only an earnest student, but also a lover of his brethren—especially of ‘these little ones.’ There is a wholesome and honest doctrine of reserve in these matters. Truth has to be adapted to the conditions of the individual case, or it ceases to be a minister of progress and a means of grace, and becomes a ‘stumbling block and an occasion to fall.’ There ought always to be the gentle and loving method of ‘as ye are able to bear it.’ Those who ruthlessly overthrow the uninstructed faith of simple souls by their brusque, brutal procedure deserve all the hard things said of them. It was the callous and contemptuous attitude of such that led the late Sir William Robertson Nicoll to make one of the strongest declarations that ever came from the pen of one accustomed to weigh well his words:

‘I am not at all sure but that heretics ought to be burnt. I mean the fellows who make a big row and split their Churches. The new truths should dawn on the Church as gently as the sunlight.’

The Biblical middleman who has the spirit of Christ will strive to live up to this ideal of light coming with the gentleness of dawn; and this is one form of the caution needed for his task.

There may be times when it is impossible to live up to this ideal; times when it is necessary to fling reserve to the winds and to abandon caution, and to make an emphatic pronouncement like that of Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch in his *Art of Reading*:

‘Here before you I proclaim that to connect in any child’s mind the Book of Joshua with the Gospels, to make its Jehovah identical in that young mind with the Father of Mercy of whom Jesus was the Son . . . is a blasphemous usage and a curse.’

Nobly spoken; but the same end will be served, and probably much more effectively, in the general work of a Biblical middleman, if he remembers, in the words of the same author on another page of the same book, that what we should get from our Bible is 'an historical sense of a race *developing* its conception of God.' That principle, duly borne in mind, and duly enforced, will obviate much strong talk about views which are blasphemous and cursed, for it will prevent such views being formed, and will let in the light upon the mind 'as gently as the sunlight.'

But it is not only the danger to the uninstructed 'little ones' that creates the need for caution. The Biblical middleman, and still more the expert, must have an eye to himself. Someone has said that the surest way of spoiling one's enjoyment of Shakespeare is to 'turn Shakespearean critic,' and Dr. Fosdick, in his *Modern Use of the Bible*, speaks of those who 'pay for their critical intelligence of the Bible by surrendering the far too precious coin of spiritual insight and appreciation.' The danger is a real one. Sometimes, in reading the dry disquisitions of those who regard themselves and are regarded as Bible experts, one has much the feeling of a lover arriving at a trysting place and finding clever and dispassionate surgeons dissecting the beloved one's corpse. 'This is the peril of the modern attitude toward the Bible,' says the arresting writer last quoted—himself an avowed 'modernist' and 'higher critic'—'folk analyse the book and think they know it, whereas the Bible at its heart cannot be known save through spiritual insight.' *There* is the great need for caution! All our study of the world's supreme book of religion will be of little use to ourselves or to others unless in the issue we find it a more vital inspiration to our religious life than it was before.

But if we do—and the postulate on which this article is based is that those who honestly and reverently apply to the Scriptures the methods of historical criticism *do* find the sacred volume a greater means of grace—then an obvious duty follows. That duty is to adopt, as far as opportunity serves, the *rôle* of Biblical middlemen, to show the more excellent way to those who are now in wandering mazes lost, and to save the generation following from many of the undesirable and unnecessary experiences of uncertainty and bewilderment which are all too common to-day.

A. GARFIELD CURNOW.

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE CAREER OF FÉLI DE LAMENNAIS

IN spite of an extensive bibliography, in spite of the fact that Féli de Lamennais can be denoted as an outstanding figure in history, one of those who occupied, however temporarily, prominent position in the eyes of the whole world, there are many for whom he is now but a name; the author of unread books; the hero of a past controversy; the victim of a common and recurring fate. Yet if his memory be buried it is not lost, but remains one of the many memories that sleep but do not die; that from time to time break forth from a lonely grave and flit once more through the world of human thought.

Lamennais, then, is almost forgotten, and yet he still lives and lives even more in virtue of his failure than of his success. For there are failures which are not a mere negation of success but which have a positive quality of their own. They signify one more attempt in the realm of the impossible, but that same realm of the impossible is the noblest exercise ground of the human soul, for in searching for the impossible is the highest possibility attained. But whereas to some daring adventurers are granted the joy and glory of attainment; of conquest, or discovery, or successful application of new thought and power to the needs of man, it is the lot of others to fall by the wayside, with soiled and crumpled banner, with diminished reputation, with sad and embittered character.

And yet the very failure of the thinker, as of the explorer, is a contribution to thought and knowledge; he has charted the illusions and contradictions of the mind as the sailor has charted the innavigable waters, though both may have perished in the effort.

On the whole, then, it may be said that the story of Lamennais is one more in the archives of human failure, and even, we might add, of human inconsistency; while he himself may be classed by some amongst the heroic, by others amongst the mistaken, or even the culpable specimens of such failure. H

bought in two camps. He began by exaggerating the claims and authority of the Church; he ended by denying them. He began by upholding the Divine right of kings, he ended by denouncing them as the tyrants and enemies of mankind.

He was born into the period of the French Revolution, in 1782; he grew up during the Napoleonic wars of conquest; he matured during the period of monarchic reaction; he had, early, a sense of an approaching era of democracy which should be more profound and pervasive than any hitherto attained. His own mind passed through some of these actions and reactions, and the question of interest is as to what continuity may be established in the process of his succeeding convictions. Are his democratic principles to be found in germ during his monarchical period? Does anything of his monarchical philosophy survive during his later democratic period? And again, can we find an early stage of his passionate love of the people in the first part of his career? Can we find anything of his intense belief in order and obedience in his later phase of enthusiasm for the instincts and characteristics of the people?

In a recent visit to La Chesnaye I gazed, in the room where he had worked, at the death cast of that strange countenance, with its emaciated features, its tormented brow, its expression of desperate struggle and utter abandonment. One read on that countenance the mark of effort, the stamp of failure. He had a short period of glory and success; but even in his halcyon days a keen observer might have predicted coming disaster. And why? Simply, I believe, because his was the ever-recurring ambition that is ever doomed to disappointment; the ever-recurring search that is ever doomed to failure; the search for the philosopher's stone that shall transmute base metal to gold; sorrow to joy; anarchy to order; discord to harmony; doubt to certainty. The philosopher's stone for Lamennais was, in the religious and social order, such a conviction and clear certainty that should make of faith the common and inevitable possession of all mankind, and of authority the sure guarantee of social peace, liberty and prosperity. His was the seductive quest of a short cut to religious certainty; an unfailing principle of religious surety and conviction. The Church was to be, in his early philosophy, the absolutely unmistakeable source of religious

light and revelation; the absolutely undeniable seat of spiritual authority. She was to be the plain manifestation of God's Truth to man, as monarchical government was to be the plain manifestation of His Will in the social order.

I suppose we may say that the mind of Lamennais was one of those minds which are in their very essence so constitutionally religious as to be almost, to use strange terms, helplessly and hopelessly religious. He was utterly incapable of taking a worldly, or a materialistic, or a hedonistic view of life. On such minds can fully appreciate the tragedy of human uncertainty in what matters so much more than anything else as to the only thing that matters at all. A great French writer has recently applied to the sufferings of the mystic, the beautiful description of *le paradoxe de la prière impossible*.¹ Yet more tragic, to the religious mind, is *le paradoxe de la certitude impossible*; the sense that only a sure faith in a spiritual world can make human life worth living, along with the consciousness that doubt stands ever at the door.

Doubt—this was the spectre which Lamennais had it in his mind to lay; the poison of religious hope and joy for which he sought an infallible antidote. We know that the many are taught by their religious rulers, to shut out the enemy by denying his existence; to think peacefully by denying the laws of thought. Lamennais sought another remedy; one that should avail for those who think as well as for those who do not think. He believed, for an instant, that he had found the wondrous panacea, the patent cure for the recurring disease. He thought that he had found, in the very mind of man, that organ and principle of certainty so long desired; and he thought that he had found, the Church, the consecrated expression of that certainty.

Truly the quest of Lamennais was akin to the search for the philosopher's stone, and was doomed to end in the same tragic disappointment unless the lesson of failure were taken to heart. The illusions of alchemy gave birth, in brave minds, to the discoveries of chemistry, and thus the search for a short cut ended in the recognition of a process. For the blind maiden in Hans Andersen's tale, the only philosopher's stone was faith, but faith cannot be confounded with ordinary human certainty. THE

¹ *Le Sentiment Religieux*, Henri Bremond.

answer to Lamennais' endeavour is that there is no short cut to abiding religious certainty; and that each principle of spiritual discovery has but its allotted place and value in the great quest.

And, after all, Lamennais himself did eventually confess to certain element of wilful illusion in his early philosophy:

I wanted to keep my eyes shut. They forced me to open them: is it my fault if I then saw clearly?

And what he saw clearly was that of which he had been ever conscious in his inmost mind; he saw the abyss over which the path of humanity is cast; a path he had endeavoured to widen into so broad a road that its edges should be beyond sight and reach.

The road does not exist, and never will exist. Whatever abiding value Lamennais' philosophy possesses is in so far as it is a contribution to a process, and not to a magical operation; and the noblest lesson to be learnt from his failure is that of the ever-restless longing of the human soul for whatever measure of spiritual certainty and peace it may be given to it to attain. It was a strange satire on Lamennais' effort to find a religious certainty, that should be as convincing to the human reason as was satisfactory to the human heart, that his *quondam* friends, and later opponents, professed to have found that certainty, but by the silencing of the reason; they 'thanked God that they had been born into a religion wherein the keenest intellectual anguish could be ended.'²

But Lamennais was a speculator; curiously enough, for a man with his interests, even in business as well as thought. His lesson was not completely learned by his first failure. Without spark of self-interest, with utter self-abandonment, he clung to his first and only aim in life—the welfare, spiritual and temporal, of man and of human society. He would first have made of the Church the perfect home of the human soul, one into which no breath of destroying doubt should blow. And when his own medicine, in virtue of the rejection of others, remained useless in his hands, and came to disagree with his own mind and soul, he sought, as so many have done, a new faith, and found it, this time in the heart and instincts of the people whom

² *Revue Européenne* VIII, p. 603, quoted by Paul Dudon. *Lamennais le St. Siège*, p. 339.

he had formerly subjected to religious and civil authority their one way of salvation.

Waking on their bed of anguish the people began to speak, and said:

Whence come our sufferings and languor, the hunger and thirst by which we are tormented, the chains that enter into our flesh and bow us to the earth?

And their minds were opened, and they understood that the sons of God, the brothers of Christ, had not been condemned to slavery by their Father, and that this slavery was the source of all the evil they endured.³

Some religious leaders, when subjected to the bitter disappointment which Lamennais endured, have turned away from other-world values, and concentrated their efforts on an improvement of the material welfare of humanity. Not so Lamennais; he remained *croyant*; he upheld the spiritual ideal as an essentially human ideal; in religion man was still to find the peace of his soul, the solace of his grief. But religion was not to be freed from all fetters of authority; its tribunal was in the heart of man himself.

You have but one Father, Who is God; but one Master, Who is Christ.

When, therefore, the mighty of the earth say to you: 'Behold your Masters,' do not believe them.⁴

Lamennais turned in fact, as others have done, and turned with blind confidence to something that has never actually existed; to the unspoilt heart of the people. All men, both rich and poor, are, to a greater or less extent, the victims of circumstances, and, to a greater or less extent, are wilful victims. Because the strong are so often responsible for the vices of the weak, Lamennais, like other lovers of the people, forgot that they were as capable of sin as their oppressors. Yet were the people really such as their idealistic advocates would represent them to be, they would scarcely need to be saved and protected; their salvation would be in their own hands.

Once more, in the *Paroles d'un Croyant*, as in the *Essai sur l'Indifférence*, Lamennais was in quest of the short cut to peace and certainty; and this time it was the magic word of liberty which had become the philosopher's stone of human happiness. Once more he sought a finality which is not of the life of man on

³ *Paroles d'un Croyant.*

⁴ *Idem.*

earth; a certainty and assurance to which the human mind is not entitled. Once more, in fact, he tried to attain the end and to avoid the process; not indeed for himself, but for the souls of his people.

The change was as rapid as it was profound. He remained the indefatigable fighter for an ennobled and spiritualized humanity; and so far his ideal was unchanged. But his ideal of a world united under a perfected system of religious and civil authority evaporated like a soap bubble. The Church had been the saving Ark on the waters of the abyss; he had shut his eyes to the abyss and invited others to do so. And now it was the Ark which he denied, and the abyss on which he concentrated his vision.

Very grievous was the sin—or, to avoid rash judgment, let us call it the mistake—of those who did everything in their power to embitter his heart, and, still worse, to complicate and damage his relations with the Holy See. Rome would often gladly refrain from a decision, but such decision is only too frequently sprung from her by a zeal which is often more self-interested than Christian. How far the tragedy might have been averted had many not hastened to take part in the pitiless chase, it is impossible to say. But in any case Lamennais committed the error of those who, having hoped too much, refuse to hope at all; he became the victim of his own disappointment. He sought a new faith, a faith in the human people; but the people can be as disappointing as the Church, and there is no path for the idealist that is not strewn with disappointment and disillusion. The worst defeat of all is not rejection by man; even by man endowed with sacred authority; it is loss of faith in the programme of one's own life, and abandonment of one's own faith.

But Lamennais was hampered by a graver difficulty than any caused by human thoughtlessness and cruelty. He was a man for whom the spiritual life was everything, but to whom was granted but little joy and hope therein. I use again a phrase which has greatly appealed to me, that expression of M. Henri Bremond as to *le paradoxe de la prière impossible*. Lamennais was a victim of that paradox; one who consecrated himself without experiencing the well-known peace and exultation that so often follow on self-consecration; one who prayed without re-

ceiving response; one who laboured in the vineyard without consciously receiving the loving pat on the shoulder and hearing the cheering words that he was a good and faithful servant.

Hence when the blow fell, and his soul had to pass through the torrent, its waters were intolerable because, if God was with him he did not know it.⁵

His story is one more tragic lesson of the futility of changing one's course under the influence of disappointment. Life is not long enough nor strong enough for such changes, and disillusion is one of the laws of life, but more of a spectre than a reality for those who face it.

On one point, however, our hero never faltered. Right to the end he never dissociated the life of man on earth from his life in heaven, nor loosed his hold on the banner of spiritual faith and endeavour.

These few thoughts are but a preliminary to a more detailed study of the philosophy of Féli de Lamennais.

M. D. PETRE.

⁵ Ps. 123 (English Psalter, Ps. 124).

BOOK REVIEWS

A GREAT COMMENTARY*

Archdeacon Charles' knowledge of apocalyptic literature and his published studies in this department of research are without a rival. Every student of the New Testament incurs heavy obligations to him. As General Editor and Contributor to *The Apocrypha and Pseudopigrapha of the Old Testament*, he was responsible for the collection and translation in one great work of practically the whole of the non-Canonical Jewish books written from 200 B.C. to 100 A.D.; his little book *Religious Developments between the Old and the New Testaments* (Home University Library) is invaluable to the general reader to whom, even to-day, the interval between the close of the Old Testament and the preaching of John the Baptist is often a blank, while his two volumes (in the International Critical Commentary) on *The Revelation of St. John* are indispensable to any student of that book. He has now published a monumental study of another Apocalypse, *The Book of Daniel*, which for a long time to come will remain the standard work on its subject. Dr. Charles had already published a smaller study of *Daniel* in The Century Bible series: in the present great work

* *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Book of Daniel*. By R. H. Charles, D.D., D.Litt., Hon. LL.D., F.B.A., Archdeacon of Westminster. (The Clarendon Press, Oxford: 1929. Price 30/-.)

his chief aim has been to recover as far as possible 'the oldest form of the text and to interpret that text in conformity with the usages of Jewish apocalyptic.' The work 'has proved to be the most difficult of all my studies in an experience of nearly forty years of research in apocalyptic literature.' The result is, like the commentary on *The Revelation of St. John*, a book which is a mine of linguistic and other learning, characterized by the same critical acumen and suggestiveness.

One of Dr. Charles' main contentions is that as a whole *Daniel* was originally written in Aramaic. If in II^{4b}—VI the author used oral or written sources, nevertheless their Aramaic form is due to the author of *Daniel* equally with Ch. VII. The attempts of Dalman, Torrey and Montgomery to ascribe Chs. II^{4b}—VI to an earlier author than the editor of the whole book are subjected to an exhaustive linguistic examination, and the theory is dismissed as 'an unintelligible error.' With the theories of Sellin and Hölischer, who admit the connection of Chs. I—VI with Ch. VII, but assign them to a pre-Maccabean date while suggesting that they have been revised by insertions referring to Antiochus, Dr. Charles 'has no objection to make if the date refers not to the present Aramaic form of these chapters, but to the traditions embodied in them.' He sets out his reasons for regarding the date of the composition of *Daniel* about or shortly before 165 B.C. Some recent attempts to date the work in the sixth century B.C. he 'cannot but regard as an absolutely hopeless task. Even linguistically it is now possible to prove the later date.' *Daniel* was originally addressed to the people as a whole and not to the few who understood Hebrew. Chs. I—II^{4a} and VIII—XII were translated into Hebrew by three different hands, either before the death of Judas Maccabaeus in 161 or at any rate not later than 153. Dr. Charles also gives evidence for supposing that Ch. I, 20-21, originally followed II, 49a, and that the dislocation occurred before the first Hebrew translation was made.

As the result of his careful study of the Versions, Dr. Charles makes a new translation of *Daniel*. The result is certainly a gain in intelligibility. The famous words 'and many shall run to and fro and knowledge shall be increased' express a thought 'wholly out of place,' and so, with the help of the LXX, Dr. Charles adopts a text wholly in keeping with contemporary eschatology, which reads 'till many become apostates, and the earth is filled with iniquity.' Dr. Charles demonstrates the inferiority of the Massoretic text. In a dozen passages it is without the support of a single version. While the M.T. represents the substance of the original text, yet 'in scores or rather hundreds of passages it is wholly untrustworthy as to the form of the original and occasionally as to its subject-matter.' In certain passages the M.T. is not older than the fourth century A.D.

In this great work there is an abundance of information which the effort to understand will be found by the intelligent reader to be well worth while. Primarily the commentary is one for scholars, and much of the complicated linguistic argument, both grammatical and philological, will be appreciated only by very advanced students. But Dr. Charles is able to convey its significance to the ordinary student. As for the clergy, if they could be persuaded to study this book, their eyes would be opened to the true value of those confident assertions that the whole critical position in regard to *Daniel* has been overthrown, which the Editors of Church Newspapers deem worthy of publication and which our scholars naturally but unfortunately too often deem unworthy of refutation.

J.S.B.

THE COLLECTS IN LATIN VERSE.*

Those who are obliged officially to attend elaborate musical services are often put to it to prevent their thoughts from wandering to secular and profane subjects, while the braying of the organ and the howling and caterwauling of the vocalists make devotional exercises impossible. The Bible Society translations of the Scriptures into strange languages are helpful. Canon Evans, of Durham, turned the Thirty-nine Articles into Greek Iambics. It is a mere guess that Dr. Macan's poems may have had a similar origin. He has not told us whether these versions were composed in University College Chapel or during the sittings of the Hebdomadal Council, or in his bath.

When I was asked to review the book, I looked forward to reading sonnets or odes or epigrams in the classical metres, and wondered which the author would choose. Bartholomew would, of course, go into elegiacs; his name is half a pentameter in itself, as a belated pagan poet saw when he wrote complimentary verses to a Christian friend:—

'Sic tibi pro scuto Bartholomaeus eat.'

But Dr. Macan has shrunk from this forbidding task, and has rendered the Collects in short rhymed lines, without regard to quantity. It was, one might think at first sight, not much more difficult than to turn them into *Hiawathians*.

'Lord, who madest all Holy Scriptures
To be written for our learning,
Grant us in such wise to hear them,
Read, mark, learn, and then digest them . . .'

But this would be an unfair judgment. There is real grace and beauty in many of the renderings, as will be recognised by the two following specimens:—

Dominica Quinta post Pascha.

O qui bona, Dominus,
das tam liberaliter
nobis servientibus
Tibi tam fideliter,
dona nobis hoc quoque :
Te auctore, Te duce,
bonum velle ; animis
cupere quod Tu cupis ;
et auxilio Tui
id agendo consequi :
omne quod per Filium
Christum poscimus tuum.

Dominica Octava post Trinitatem.

O qui gubernas omnia
constanti providentia
in coelis et terram super !
ut nobis cuncta bona des,
et mala procul segreges,
rogamus Te humiliter :
per Jesum Christum Filium
tuum, nostrique Dominum.

* *The Collects Rendered into Latin Verse.* By R. W. Macan, D.Litt., sometime Master of University College, Oxford. (Basil Blackwell, Oxford. Price 21/- net.)

It is a triumph to have caught, if only occasionally, the subtle and delicate grace of the old Latin hymns, so entirely different from classical poetry, but with a strange beauty of their own. Even the drinking songs of the 'Wandering Scholars' show the same power of bringing quite new melodies out of what was not then a dead language. Modern scholars very rarely attempt anything in this *genre*.

W. R. INGE.

THE MEDIAEVAL INQUISITION.*

M. Guiraud is the author of an important book on the Cathars, the fruit of original work on the Vatican archives. He belongs to the Duchesne group of scientific Church historians, which includes for this particular period Bishop Douais and G. Mollat. M. Guiraud holds that scientific history does not deal in moral judgments. But as a matter of fact it does; otherwise there would not appear at the beginning of this book the words 'Nihil obstat,' which is the ultimate moral judgment. If moral judgments are eliminated we might accept Henry Ford's aphorism that 'History is bunk.' Unconsciously M. Guiraud agrees. He does not say that a Cathar or a Lollard is a bad or irreligious man, but he says he is 'a socialist' or 'anarchical' or 'communistic' or 'anti-patriotic.' It is not difficult to believe that he uses these words as weapons of offence.

The Mediaeval Inquisition is translated from the French and is therefore intended for general readers. The translation is adequate if pedestrian; it is marred by a lack of uniformity in transliterating names (Pierre de Castelnau is sometimes Peter of Castelnau) and a preference for the French form of names that have a recognized English dress (*e.g.* Philippe le Bel). There is no index, a reprehensible absence, but other scholars might with advantage copy its praiseworthy economy in the use of footnotes and otiose references.

The mediaeval Inquisition came into existence in France; its history is almost entirely confined to France and the adjacent parts of other countries. After the year 1000, possibly as an after effect of the decay of millennial hopes, thought began to stir among the uneducated. It fastened upon the evil of the world, to which the Church itself had succumbed. From the eleventh century right down to Wyclif the tide of intellectual and moral revolt rose and rose. The revolt had different names, but the undercurrent of ideas was the same. It is outside our scope to investigate these ideas. They originated in class consciousness. They were the protest (at first illiterate) against the theology of power and wealth. They began with the poor man's conviction that the world in which he lived was so bad that it must be the creation of the devil. They developed into the Spiritual Franciscans' belief, reflected perhaps in the *Theologia Germanica*, that property was the root of the evil. Then the most ruthless thinker of the middle ages, Wyclif, said: The evil is not in possession, but in possession by evil men. Therefore Grace alone confers sovereignty, the rights of property. From the beginning many of the feudal nobles adhered to the new thought, apparently on anti-ecclesiastical grounds. In South Western France the Cathars swamped the Church. At last, in 1248, after the murder of the Papal legate, Pierre de Castelnau, Pope Innocent III called for vengeance to be inflicted on Raymond, Count of Toulouse. Simon de Montfort's crusade against the Albigenses followed, a bloody business lasting for years. In the end the Count of Toulouse yielded (1229) and agreed in the treaty of

* *The Mediaeval Inquisition*. By Jean Guiraud. Translated from the French by E. Messinger. (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1929. Price 6/-.)

peace to a seeking out (*inquisitio*) of heretics. This seeking out is the origin of the Inquisition (1233). It was in theory an extension of episcopal action against heresy. The inquisitors were special commissioners, usually Dominicans or Franciscans, appointed by the Pope. In theory their office was not to supersede the bishops. In fact it usually did. When Cauchon, Bishop of Beauvais, relegated the inquisitor to a secondary place at the trial of Joan of Arc, it is so unusual as to be called irregular. In England the Inquisition functioned only once (before the Reformation)—at the examination of the Templars in 1309—and then Greenfield, Archbishop of York, refused to sit with the inquisitors himself and informed the Pope that he could not permit the Bishops of Lincoln and Chichester to sit in the province of York.

Inquisitorial trials proceeded empirically. A system was thus produced and by some inquisitors embodied in handbooks. In theory the process was a trial. Respectable laymen were consulted as a kind of jury. Witnesses were admitted. Advocates were not excluded. In actual practice, however, many inquisitors discouraged advocates. The evidence of the accused was preferred to any other, and was extracted by torture. Witnesses could not be subpoenaed and (though M. Guiraud does not say so) it is supposed that they also might be tortured. The evil of this system lay in the fact that the Inquisitors used the machinery of penal justice on what was really the jurisdiction of the confessor. There was no uniformity of usage. One of the best of the inquisitors, Bernard Gui, acted with conspicuous moderation; he passed the death-sentence, comparatively rarely, 42 times in 930 cases. William of Paris, on the other hand, did not hesitate to apply torture to the Templars until twenty-five of them died under it. It is agreed that in the time of William of Paris the Inquisition was less an instrument of the Church than a tool of the French Crown. But surely that is its complete condemnation. For it shows it to have been a sinister machine entirely at the mercy of unscrupulous men. It is too much to ask us to believe that so long as the Pope dominated it, its fruits were good, but when the Crown dominated it, its fruits were evil. It was the same machine, manned by the same type of official, following the same procedure. The task of inquisitor was one that no man could be expected to undertake and remain a Christian.

E. J. MARTIN.

INCARNATION AND PERSONALITY.*

Every age has its own characteristic conceptions which constitute its peculiar approach to reality. And, as Dr. Rashdall insisted, it is the business of theologians to utilise the thought-forms of their day not merely in a superficial way by giving a deft turn of phrase to old doctrines, but by re-interpreting these in terms of current philosophy. Dr. Moberly's great work on *Atonement and Personality* was such an attempt—though it met with Dr. Rashdall's scathing criticisms for the things which it failed to do. But Moberly saw that the modern stress on personality encouraged a new attitude to the problem of Atonement. That he failed to achieve a convincing solution was due, not to a wrong approach, but to the fact that he failed to follow it up. He combatted a view of personality which looked for its *essentia* in mutual exclusiveness; but he accepted a doctrine of Incarnation which almost certainly demanded that.

A recent book, written by nine leading Free Churchmen, carries forward Dr. Moberly's work by approaching the whole problem of Christology

* *The Lord of Life*. (S.C.M., 1929; 350 pp. Price 10/-.)

from the standpoint of the meaning and significance of personality: we believe it would have received a hearty welcome from Dr. Rashdall.

The Lord of Life is sub-titled 'A Fresh Approach to the Incarnation.' It embodies a courageous attempt to give an interpretation of Jesus large enough to reveal His Divinity in and through His Humanity. Part (1) is concerned with the Human Problem, and the first essay, entitled 'Reality in Religion,' approaches this problem by attempting to recapture the disciples' experience of Jesus. What man needs is not a knowledge of God which is abstract, but a revelation in terms of experience. And, as Mr. J. Lewis insists, 'Experience is revelation: the more distinctive personal insight grows, the more we see.' But it is just this insight into the nature of the true life as God wills it that experience of Jesus affords: 'The prophets had been led, inspired, checked by a half-seen vision of the ideal life; but at last that ideal is wholly seen and perfectly obeyed. Seeing it accepted and set forth in the life of Jesus, we realise that His life is God's purpose for man' (p. 16). A supplementary essay by the Rev. G. E. Darlaston on 'Man's need of a Deliverer' deals with that disharmony of personality and inner conflict in man which lies between his ideal and its achievement.

In Part (2), there are two papers dealing with 'Christ in the New Testament.' The first is an admirable survey showing the Historic Jesus living and growing and triumphing in the various activities of life. We should interpret a detail here and there differently, but we are at one with Dr. Cadoux in his interpretation of the struggle of Jesus. 'Whatever were the birth-gifts of Jesus, there is not the slightest reason to think that it was easier for Him to be good than for us' (p. 55). It is because of that struggle and because of His triumph in it that He remains for us the Master of personal living. And not only remains, but lives and works. In an interesting essay on the Development of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age, Dr. H. T. Andrews emphasises the fact that the dominant factor of that age was neither the record of the historic facts about Jesus, nor the infiltration of current philosophical ideas, but the centrality of Jesus in living experience—'the impulse of Christ guiding, inspiring, compelling obedience.' It was this living, present reality of Christ in the Christian fellowship as well as in the individual which raised the problem of the Person of Christ, and made men seek for a 'formula for personality' in the highest thought-forms anywhere to be found. Dr. Andrews adds: 'We are not bound by the terms these early Christians used, but we are bound by the terms of their quest. . . . Only the highest categories we can discover will serve our need and suffice us for the interpretation of Christ' (p. 113).

In Part (3) Dr. Vernon Bartlet contributes three essays on Christ in Theology, in which he not only sketches in scholarly way the progress of Christology through the centuries, but also examines and justifies the development of its expression. But, fine as are many of the conceptions and much of the symbolism in which Christology has been elaborated, there is no doubt that it has failed to be intellectually or morally satisfying. Dr. Bartlet attributes this to the fact that it was based on wrong premises: 'The ancient Church conceived the unity of Christ's historical personality, not psychologically as a living fact of moral experience to begin with, but rather as an intellectual synthesis of two abstract conceptions, Divine "nature" and human "nature"' (p. 122). And so 'for want of a fitter category, Christology fumbled with the facts in terms of "nature," "essence," "substance," rather than of wills within one self-consciousness or personality. The chief thing which the Church's common mind had really

achieved was to keep the full problem before itself verbally in the form of a paradox' (p. 161).

The last part of the book, for which the rest has been preparatory, consists of four papers on Christ to-day. Professor D. Miall Edwards takes the main weight in 'A Christology in Modern Times.' To seek an interpretation in the highest categories open to us will mean taking into account such principles as those of Natural Law, Evolution, Personality, Value etc. In accordance with these, he dismisses 'such overdrawn subtleties as a human nature without human personality, or human experiences without a human subject. Such a conception rather reminds us of the grin of the Cheshire cat without the cat' (p. 201). We breathe a sigh of relief to see that grin disappear. But the problem remains, and Prof. Miall Edwards proceeds to elucidate it. While accepting as fundamental the true and full humanity of our Lord, it is necessary also to take into account those things which show Him associated in a wholly unique way with God. For example, He was unique in His intimate knowledge and experience of God, not mere 'head-knowledge,' but 'that original, unmediated, first-hand acquaintance which issues from a living personal experience' (p. 210). There was also His unique sovereign authority arising out of His sense of vocation in relation to the Kingdom of God.' Yet Christ always spoke of God as of Another. 'God was to Christ the great Object of faith, trust, obedience, and love.'

To include these in an intelligible doctrine, such terms as substance and hypostasis must give place to those concerning personal and ethical values. The harmony of mind and spirit, identity of conscious purpose, complete mutual understanding and co-operation, these are the highest terms in which we can express the union of the Son with the Father. 'Christ's Divinity means that the values incarnated in His character and the quality of His will are Divine, and reveal to us the nature of Ultimate Reality in so far as it can be revealed to man. . . . If it be asked whether the Divine element which became incarnate in Christ was personal in the pre-incarnate period, we would reply that it was in a sense eternally personal—for it was the Spirit of the eternal personal God, but not in the sense that it was *Another* or second person side by side with the Father within the one Divine Being. . . . The religious truth and interests for which the doctrines of the pre-existence of Christ have in the past stood are safeguarded by the view that the Christ values pre-existed in the one personal God' (p. 219). This is, as Prof. Miall Edwards acknowledges, a bold adventure of re-interpretation; but we believe that it retains all that was intended to be expressed in the older doctrines, while disregarding the mental gymnastics which they involved.

And what of the relation of the Divine and the Human in Christ? This raises the problem of the relation of Eternity and Time, and Prof. Miall Edwards argues in an interesting and, we believe, convincing way that these are not mutually exclusive. 'The eternal view of a time-process is not the view of all its stages simultaneously, but the view of them as elements or members of a completed purpose. God's span of consciousness is all-inclusive; ours is very limited. In a word, to put it rather crudely, there is an element of time in God's eternal life and an element of eternity in man's temporal life' (p. 225). Viewed in this light, the Incarnation is the culmination of that double movement of God's desire to communicate Himself to man and of man's innate craving for God. It was not a momentary act but a continuous activity, 'a growing, dynamic thing, the progressive

assimilation of God by Christ, a voluntary, ethical process, a spiritual achievement' (p. 227). This does not deny, but implies the presence in Christ of a unique, native endowment as a Divine potentiality—an element of 'givenness,' which starting in the subconscious region had to be voluntarily appropriated and assimilated by the conscious will. 'In this sense Christ's Divine Sonship was an achievement of His moral personality, a voluntary opening up of His life to God, so that His life contained as much of the fulness of God as was possible at every stage of His history' (p. 228). It is along these lines—which we believe Modernists will find most helpful—that the writer seeks to avoid the juxtaposition of two disparate 'natures' and to substitute the view that 'Christ was most Divine when most human in the ideal sense.'

The three remaining essays are not less interesting: the Rev. F. C. Bryan contributes a chapter on Christ in present Experience, while the Rev. H. H. Farmer is responsible for another dealing with Christ's right to our Worship, and the Rev. Malcolm Spencer sums up in the concluding chapter what should be the Church's witness to its Lord of Life.

This is undoubtedly a book of considerable importance, with a constructive Modernism which will prove of great help to many.

J.P.H.

THE LEGEND OF HELL.*

By 'hell' Dr. Dearmer means what is popularly meant, a place or state of penal suffering either physical or mental indefinitely prolonged. The word 'hell' occurs in the B.C.P. only in the Apostles' Creed, where it is supposed to have another meaning. The unscriptural phrases 'everlasting death' and 'eternal death' found in the Catechism and in the Burial Office need not have the same implication as 'hell.' 'Everlasting fire' is found in the *Quicunque Vult* and in the Communion Service, and led to the disuse of those documents as far back at least as living memory goes. It is supplementary devotional imagination that has taken most willingly to the hell-theme. Hymns A. and M. accepted it. I notice in a book largely used by the clergy, *The Priest's Book of Private Devotion* (ed. of 1913), this passage on page 508: 'Here . . . consider the chief motives to contrition, viz. . . . the torments of hell.' When the Privy Council 'dismissed hell with costs' in 1864, 11,000 of the clergy protested. Probably, outside Roman Catholics, believers in hell to-day are found only among the clergy. All honour to the name of Farrar. We may smile at his *Life of Christ*, and *Eric*, but let us smile gratefully, for it was the emotion that created them, that, tempered by reason, quenched the everlasting bonfire for the bulk of English-speaking people.

The second part of Dr. Dearmer's book is a most useful summary of modern exegesis of the apocalyptic elements in our Lord's teaching. The English of the Gospels does cause perplexity even to educated Christians. It is worth saying many times that no equivalent either for 'hell' or for 'damnation' occurs either in the Greek of the New Testament or in the Hebrew of the Old Testament. It is useful too to be reminded how consistently the editors or copyists exaggerate the fear *motif* by means of additions like the perpetual refrain inserted in Matthew, 'There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.'

* *The Legend of Hell*. By Percy Dearmer, D.D. Illustrated. (London: Cassell & Co., 1929. Price 7/6.)

Where perhaps Dr. Dearmer might have developed his argument more fully is in considering whether there is any reality at all behind this painful scenery. Agreed that the good is productive of eternal life, of what is the bad productive? If it is only the negation of good and therefore productive of nothing, is it destructive? Can it ultimately destroy personality? Dear Inge says, 'The punishment of habitual sin is to become a bad man,' which is entirely in accord with the principle of rationality existing in Nature. What is the end of the bad man? Two errors corrupted the quasi-Christianity of mediaevalism. One was that the bad man as developed in the human environment represented a final and permanent reality. The other was more fundamental. It was the error of God the Implacable Despot. In popular practice the result of the first was the Manichæan belief in the devil, of the second the pagan belief in the efficiency of the operative sacrifices of the Mass.

It is to be hoped that Dr. Dearmer will give us a companion volume on the Legend of the Devil. One final word of praise for the illustrations: They reveal better than any argument the twisted mind of mediaevalism.

E. J. MARTIN.

THE CHRISTIAN OUTLOOK IN THE MODERN WORLD.*

Although comparatively small, the Church of Ireland is to be felicitated that its highest station is occupied by one who not only stands in the loftiest rank as a theologian and philosopher, but is also eminently an exponent of a liberal and progressive theology. This book proceeds from a mind which is definitely sympathetic with modern thought and its problems, which believes in freedom of inquiry, and is opposed to the non-cast dogmatism of theological systems. Dr. d'Arcy is not one of those who in a hesitating and reluctant manner feel that theology by dire necessity has to come to terms with modern science and investigation—on the contrary, he comes forward to welcome the latter whole-heartedly as a revelation of new truth. Convinced of the eternal truth, which essential Christianity enshrines, he has no fear that the new revelation will overthrow and supersede the old. Nor can he, like some, regard the present unsettled condition of thought as in itself an evil, but rather he looks upon the very search for truth as a good and providential thing—a great adventure of hope and faith.

In the earlier chapters, the writer deals with the primary subject of Creation and the relationship of God and the world.

Concurring enthusiastically with the general view of scientific men as to the origin of things—the conception of Evolution, he has no sympathy with the Fundamentalist attitude. 'Our gains have indeed been so many that the present attack on this idea in the name of religion seems almost unintelligible. Does any sane man to-day wish to return to Dante's conception of the Universe? Or even to Milton's? Dante and Milton are amongst the greatest of poets. But we of to-day can no more accept their views of the Universe than they can accept that of Homer.' Again: 'it is time for the Church to change her methods. She would no longer condemn Galileo; but there are many even now who denounce Darwin, and there are those who think the whole idea of evolution fatal to the Christian ideas of God and the world.' He strongly urges that the scientific view is in no

* *The Christian Outlook in the Modern World.* By Charles F. D'Arcy, D.D., F.B.A., Archbishop of Armagh. (Hodder & Stoughton. 7/6.)

way inconsistent with a spiritual interpretation of the world. For such interpretation we have 'the witness of all the ages of human belief and reflection.' The writer traces the growth of a spiritual conception from its dawn in primitive Animism, through the great Polytheistic religions, to the developed Monotheism of Israel, which passing to Christianity and to Islam has become the possession of the modern world. With Monotheism comes the union of religion with morality. 'It is Monotheism which enables us to speak of conscience as the voice of God.' Even at the lower levels, this spiritual interpretation of nature is 'the source of all that is most splendid in human achievement.' The permanent value of the Old Testament is that it enshrines 'the true revelation and the definite triumph of Monotheistic faith.' It is impossible for the educated man of to-day to accept literally the Biblical accounts of Creation and the Fall. Such accounts cannot be treated as historical or scientific in the modern sense—yet they have 'an abiding spiritual value which no criticism can take away. Intelligence and purpose cannot be excluded from the Universe. Theoretical science, indeed, reveals the reign of unvarying laws of nature, but on the other hand all applied practical science is the record of man mastering the forces of nature and making them his obedient slaves. 'If the world is plastic to man, what must it be to God!' God has not set in motion a vast machine, but He is 'constantly moulding the world, responding to every movement of the life which it contains, guiding the course of events with a view to some supreme purpose.'

In a chapter entitled 'the Divine Man,' Dr. d'Arcy discusses the central idea of Christianity. 'There is in the Gospels,' he writes, 'no hint that the Infant Christ revealed any qualities but those which purposely belong to a human being at that stage in his development.' The writer does not even regard the scene in the Temple during the boyhood of Jesus as any proof of supernatural wisdom, but simply as a deep and wonderful penetration with spiritual things. The wonderful works of Christ, taken by themselves, do not prove His Divinity. The Divinity of Christ is to be found in three elements: (1) the perfection of His Humanity; (2) His revelation of God; (3) His victory through death and resurrection. 'And these are elements which can be proved and tested to-day quite as well as in the beginning. They need no critical examination of texts, no elaborate investigation of sources, no dogmatic system to support or interpret them.' After an elaborate and beautiful setting forth of these elements from the Gospel story, he goes on to say: 'The doctrine of the Incarnation as presented in the past, introduced into Christian thought a war of principles which no effort of the theologians ever overcame.. How to reconcile the two natures in the One Person was the problem out of which sprang all the ancient heresies. And while faith could triumph by the affirmation of both the Divine and the human, theology never quite succeeded in the task of justifying this venture. But according to the writer, it is impossible to imagine any more fitting manifestation of the Divine than is to be found in the life and death of Christ. 'In Him is manifestation both the Divine and the human in a perfect union. Only the perfect humanity can reveal the Divinity.'

On the subject of 'Immortality,' Dr. d'Arcy maintains that modern philosophy has much to say in favour of the notion of the immortality of the soul. The self is the ultimate fact of our experience, and we have no reason to suppose that the decay of the bodily organism must mean the dissipation of the self. Yet he holds that the only completely satisfactory

idea is the Christian doctrine of the Resurrection as interpreted by St. Paul. 'As the natural life has a bodily organ adapted to its purposes, so the spiritual life—that higher mode of existence to which man has attained—must have its appropriate means of expression.'

In two excellent chapters on 'Adventure' and 'Divine Suffering,' the writer presents a view of Deity which is in harmony with the deepest moral convictions of our modern age. He describes God as the Great Adventure—the Being who is willing to take risks in order to bring about great moral and spiritual results. He protests against the notion of the greatness of the Deity which makes it to consist in aloofness and isolation from human suffering and struggle. God must be regarded as sharing in such: 'God, the Supreme Being . . . does not cut Himself off from His creature: in the isolation of transcendent joy or 'delectation,' but enters into our life, sharing its difficulties and sorrows, helping us in our weakness, and this age-long method of Divine love and Divine greatness found its supreme expression in the life, passion and death of Christ.'

In a chapter on the 'Ascent of Thought,' Dr. d'Arcy shows that religious thought is not something fixed, but continually advancing. 'If the history of science shows an Ascent of Thought, the history of religion shows an Ascent of Faith.' This is especially true of our modern age. 'In our time,' he writes, 'other influences have been at work, and the hard shell of theological prejudice has been softened. A great volume of kindly humanitarian feeling, nourished by the democratic tendencies of modern life, and spreading more widely the call to sympathy with the suffering; the needy, the ignorant and the oppressed has reacted on our thought of God. Also the life of Jesus has been studied in a more human way: it has been realised that His mind was by no means that of the hard-shelled theologian. His love was poured out on the poor and the stricken, on the publicans and sinners; His hardest words were for the proud domineering churchman.' Referring to the expression 'the Wrath of God,' the writer says, 'there is no warrant for the theological implication which has been found in these words, that God's love is so alienated from sinful man that it has to be won back by some great act of intervention. There is no ground for the idea that the Atonement effects a changing of the mind of God from hostility to kindness. There is no reconciling of God to us, as some of our theological statements affirm.' Again, speaking of the dread belief in a flaming hell to which the vast majority of mankind were thought to be destined, he writes: 'Every enlightened mind has now decided against the accepted view of former times. The real force of our modern denial of the older doctrine is our heightened sense of the nature of God as revealed in Jesus Christ; our firm conviction that it is impossible to believe that He whose very nature is love can commit multitudes of His sensitive creatures, weak as they are and erring though they be, to an eternity of torment . . . We must surely hold that the all-embracing love of God will finally break down all opposing barriers of hardened evil, and complete his New Creation.'

The Archbishop's book is written in a fine literary style and adorned with a wealth of illustration drawn from very varied sources. It breathes an admirable spirit—fervent love of truth, freedom from theological prejudice, sympathy with modern life, kindly humanity, cheering optimism about human destiny. We may well regard it as a great landmark of the advance of constructive liberal thought within the Church of Ireland.

WILLIAM R. M. ORR.

THE CHRISTIAN TASK IN INDIA.*

The object of this book is to give an account of the principal activities of Christian missions in India and to estimate their future possibilities. The authors of the several articles deal with particular branches of work—educational, literary, social and industrial—with which they have been associated, and endeavour by careful analysis and criticism of the present system to discover methods of improvement. The book should, therefore, be of great practical value to all those who are interested or engaged in mission work both in India and elsewhere. But the question of central importance is this: how far these forms of service are promoting the presentation of the Gospel of Christ? Dr. S. K. Dalta, in an article entitled 'The Nature of the Task,' traces three interpretations of the process of Christianising India, since the beginning of the nineteenth century, *viz.* (1) substitution, (2) permeation, (3) transformation. He finds examples of substitution and permeation still in existence, but is of opinion that anything like 'a mechanical conception' of the progress of Christianity must now be abandoned. Christianity must 'divest herself of the imperial purple': rid herself of the Western trappings of industrialism and economic power: and devote herself entirely to spiritual ends.' In his view, missionary institutions should confine their energies chiefly to improving the quality of education, for 'there is truth in the contention that Christianity, as introduced to India through the missionary system, has (it may be in spite of itself) exercised a dominating influence of power and authority.' Christianity has to be transformed by absorbing some of the wealth of spiritual experience and religious idealism of the East, and its future task is 'to create in India a Church—not a community—whose agents will be a spiritual order of men and women, without distinction of race, who will give to India through their lives and teaching the inexhaustible riches of Christ.' With this ideal few will find fault, and it is reiterated in different words by Mr. J. A. Davies in *An English Layman's Contribution*. 'In the building up of the Church Universal that is to be,' he says, 'Indian thought and tradition, freed from the incubus of a slave mentality, has a contribution to make of unique and vital value.' 'The Indian will bring his own treasures to the feet of the Master.' He criticizes severely the detached attitude of the average Briton in India towards the life and soul of the Indian people. He would have the missionaries 'forget they are Christians' with all the political and sectarian associations of that word and become in name first the brothers that in fact so many of them in practice are to Hindu, Moslem and Christian alike. The task of Christianity 'is the bringing of the people of India—the British sojourner no less than the native Indian—into the Fellowship of the Kingdom of God.' These lofty ideals can easily be corrected by Western common-sense, and Mr. Edwards, in his chapter on 'Public Questions,' sympathetically reviews the various problems—social, moral, and political—which India may have to face on her spiritual pilgrimage. But perhaps India will do well to continue to cling to blind hope rather than to high visions, for 'one never mounts so high,' said Oliver Cromwell, 'as when one knows not whither one is going.'

Our readers may be glad to know that this volume contains a valuable contribution by Bishop Palmer of Bombay, and others, on the important movement towards Christian unity in India. C.J.

* *The Christian Task in India*. By Various Writers. Edited by the Rev. John Mackenzie. (Macmillan & Co., 1929. 7/6.)

SHORT NOTICES.

A Short Bible (Basil Blackwell, Oxford) is a collection of 350 passages from the Authorised Version. It has been made by V. J. K. Brook, A. David, W. H. Fyfe and A. E. Lynam. Each reading is printed, under suitable heading and without verse division, in a fine clear type, and the price for these 222 pages is extraordinarily cheap at 2/6. If limitations of space made it impossible to print more than five short passages from the Apocrypha we could have spared some of the Old Testament citations in order to make room for more from this too little-known source, and it is a pity that the fine verses in *II Corinthians* iv, have not been included. But as a whole the selection is excellent.

Stories from the Bible, by Walter De La Mare (Faber and Gwyer, Ltd. price 7/6) is a set of paraphrases of selections from the first nine books of the Old Testament, including stories from the narratives of the Garden of Eden, the Flood, Joseph, Moses, Samson, Samuel, Saul and David. The author keeps as close as he can to the spirit of the actual Biblical text and sometimes preserves it intact, and departs from it in order to remove the difficulties which exist for those not familiar with the Bible. The work is well done.

The *Study Bible* series now includes two further volumes, *I and II Corinthians* and *Ephesians to Philemon* (taken in the New Testament order). The series is published by Cassell and Co. Ltd., and the price is 3/6 a volume. Each volume contains three 'Studies,' the first consisting of an 'Appreciation' or short Introduction, the second and longest 'Study' is expository, and the third is chiefly an investigation of critical questions. In each book the first two 'Studies' are by the same author and the third by another. The Principal of Rawdon College, Leeds, and the Bishop of Middleton are responsible for the *Corinthian Epistles*, Dr. Orchard and Dr. N. P. Williams for *Ephesians to Philemon*. The second 'Study' in each case largely consists of quotations from varied sources which comment on or illustrate selected phrases from the Epistles. These are excellent little books, containing much more than is at first sight apparent, and should prove very useful in Bible Study Groups.

Renewal of Life in the Clergy, by David Jenks, S.S.M. (Longmans, price 3/6) contains eight chapters on Prayer, Bible-reading and the Holy Communion. As the title suggests, much of the contents has been used in addresses to the clergy, and is of a practical character. The book is concerned with personal religious life, and is a good example of how restraint in language increases reality and dignity in treating of this subject. The way in which the author has subordinated his personal theological leanings in the attempt to deal with what is common to all the clergy, disarms criticism, and there must be few clergy who could not extract refreshment from the quiet consideration of this book.

F. B. Meyer, by A. Chester Mann, of New York, (George Allen and Unwin: price 5/- and 3/6) is not in the strict sense a biography. It is but a partial record of the great work of a man who 'knew himself,' and who seems to have been untroubled by any doubts as to the certainty and sufficiency of his message. The author was a friend of Dr. Meyer and writes as such. Throughout, he uses the language of eulogy, and before the end the ordinary reader will weary of it, but his judgment that Dr. Meyer 'was not a seer, merely offering purer and keener lights in return

or an evermore arduous effort and sacrifice, but a man who believed that 'life may be turned to immeasurable beauty by every hand that works and every heart that feels' undoubtedly indicates one fundamental factor in the great preacher's success. Though the actual form in which Dr. Meyer's message was presented would not appeal so strongly to-day, the Church will always need men of his simplicity and conviction.

The Christian and Birth Control, by Edward Lyttleton, D.D. (S.P.C.K. : price 3/6) is prefaced by an Open Letter to the Bishops appealing for a definite pronouncement of guidance on this subject from the forthcoming Lambeth Conference. Of the urgency of the matter there can be no doubt. The teaching of the Roman Church is definite enough, and might be more valuable if it were not (like that of our own Bishops who speak most definitely on this subject) the teaching of celibates. Moreover, mere definiteness is not necessarily good. That the Roman Church can set aside its never truly made, a marriage which had survived long enough to witness its issue grown to maturity, has led many to doubt whether its pronouncements on matters connected with marriage are of any moral value at all. Dr. Lyttleton forgets these facts in comparing so favourably the definiteness of Rome with the 'silence' of our own episcopate. He presents his case in the form of a conversation between a social worker, a doctor and a vicar. The good side of the argument is the insistence that the Christian life is essentially a life of self-discipline, and what Dr. Lyttleton regards as the bearing of this on the subject in discussion is set out at length by the doctor, supported by the vicar. The book might have had considerable value if the other side of the case had been as fully stated, but 'social worker' appears as a weak individual who is ready to swallow anything the others say 'with but little persuasion.' If those who do need convincing of the truth of Dr. Lyttleton's contentions were really like his 'social worker,' the whole problem would be immensely simplified, and there would be little need for his book and none for any other! The omission of many platitudes would have reduced the length of the argument and increased its weight.

Doubts and Difficulties, by Cyril Alington, Headmaster of Eton, (Longman's : 5/-) is justified in all but its price. The Archbishop of York, in a brief Introduction, rightly says that the author has succeeded in the difficult task of being 'simple and brief at once without being misleading.' The character of the book can be correctly judged from the author's words to the Rev. P. B. Clayton: 'I hope you are right in believing that some people who distrust solemnity and won't tackle big books by real theologians will be led by this type of argument to do a little first-hand thinking for themselves.' The main doctrines of Christianity and the familiar difficulties about them are discussed as the preface leads us to expect. We regard the book as very useful for those young folk who have been brought up as Christians and who are beginning to have intellectual doubts about the forms of faith they have been taught, and to whom doubt is still interesting: those for whom doubt has become *grim* would only be irritated by Dr. Alington's method of treatment. But to such it is not addressed. It is meant 'only to suggest lines of thought,' and as such it is good.

The Religions of Mankind, by S. M. E. Trood (Christopher's : 3/6) is an able condensation into 154 pages of the main facts about the great religions. It would make a good Introduction to Comparative Religion. In addition, there are chapters on the origins and early growth of religion and its progress in past civilizations. Miss Trood is History Mistress at

Wycombe High School, and her point of view is that 'it will not do to be satisfied with that old classification of the religions of the world into Christianity and "heathenism,"' but amidst all the similarities in man's religious aspirations 'Christianity is unique in its one great central fact—Christ Himself.' From a brief Bibliography, otherwise good, we note the omission of some small books of first-rate value.

J.S.B.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE CONSISTENCY OF DR. HENSON?

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*.

SIR,

I do not complain of Mr. Bezzant's denial of my 'consistency,' for it is sufficiently apparent that no man, who has the misfortune to find himself compelled to abandon in later life a cause which he has championed throughout his career, can reasonably hope to disprove a charge of 'inconsistency.' The most that he can do is to explain as best he can the reasons which have led him to change his mind. This I have done in the Introduction to my published 'Charge,' and if, after reading what I have said, my critics are still dissatisfied, I must acquiesce in the fact.

When, however, Mr. Bezzant proceeds to accuse me, not merely of inconsistency, but also of 'misrepresentation,' I must needs resent an accusation which reflects on my personal honour.

I am specifically accused of 'misrepresenting' Dr. Major because, in a review of his booklet, *Modern Problems of the Church*, I directed attention to the paradox that, while Dr. Major insisted that '*the religion of Jesus Himself was the Christian religion*,' he yet insisted also that not even a belief in the historical existence of Jesus was *essential* to Christianity. I gave the reference to an article by Dr. Major in the *Modern Churchman* (Oct., 1928). After reading again the whole section significantly headed '*If Jesus is unhistoric, can we still be Christians?*' I am quite unable to arrive at any other conclusion than that, in Dr. Major's view, the question ought to be answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Bezzant appears to imagine that I credited Dr. Major with himself disbelieving in the historical existence of Jesus, but that was far from my mind, and certainly not conveyed by my words. The whole point of my argument was that, while making all turn on history in one connexion, he yet treated history as non-essential in another. Let anyone be at the pains of reading, first, what Dr. Major actually wrote, and, then, what I said in commenting on his words. I have no fear as to the result. He may agree or disagree with my opinions, but he will not accuse me of misrepresenting Dr. Major's.

Auckland Castle.

HERBERT DUNELM :

January 4th, 1930.

REPLY OF MR. BEZZANT.

SIR,

Dr. Henson regards my charge of misrepresentation as reflecting on his personal honour. It is therefore the more strange that of the *four* instances of misrepresentation which I cited against him, he has only attempted to reply to *one*.

Dr. Major wrote, 'it is possible, I think, to believe in the essential truth' of the Incarnation, Atonement, and Resurrection, 'without believing in an historical Jesus.' On the assertion that 'if we lost the historical Jesus to-day we should also lose the Christian religion,' he commented, 'I doubt

Dr. Henson wrote :

'Dr. Major insists that even the historical existence of Jesus is not essential to Christianity. . . . His view that even the very existence of Jesus is optional is, of course, totally incompatible with Apostolic Christianity.'

would observe :

1. If Dr. Major *doubts* a proposition, he must not be assumed necessarily to *insist* on its opposite.

2. Dr. Major merely argued, with the clear intention of encouraging those who fear otherwise, that *if it could be proved that Jesus never existed*, 'a form of Christianity' would still be possible. He did not claim that this form would be historical Christianity. He stated that this 'form of Christianity' could be a religion finding its realization in 'a life of which the dominating ideal was obedience to the Divine Will as set forth in the Synoptic Gospels,' and that it would be a great moral and spiritual force.

3. I did not imagine that the Bishop had 'credited Dr. Major with himself disbelieving in the historical existence of Jesus.' I stressed Dr. Major's personal belief because, if he insisted that '*the religion of Jesus Himself was the Christian religion*,' Dr. Henson could not *reasonably* regard him as also *insisting*, to the point of paradox, that another belief, involving a theory which in the same article Dr. Major repudiated as '*grotesque*,' was nevertheless equally legitimate or 'optional.'

I submit that the 'paradox' to which the Bishop 'directed attention' has no existence except as created by his own misrepresentation of Dr. Major as *insisting* 'that even the historical existence of Jesus is not essential to Christianity,' when Dr. Major does no more than *concede* that in the event of a theory that Jesus never existed (which in fact is '*grotesque*') being proved to be true, all would not be lost, but that 'a form of Christianity' would still be possible and valuable. Only in this careful and quite clearly qualified sense does Dr. Major, in the article referred to, answer the question '*If Jesus is unhistoric, can we still be Christians?*' in the affirmative; and I am confident that readers of that article will find nothing in it to justify Dr. Henson's assertion that Dr. Major's belief is '*that even the very existence of Jesus is optional*.'

Dr. Major's article is both logical and constructive: the impression given by Dr. Henson's comments—and he well knows that controversialists are eager to make the most of them—is that the article is paradoxical and destructive. And when we recall that at an anxious period of Dr. Henson's life, Dr. Major stoutly supported him and became his Examining Chaplain, we not unreasonably expect that if a Christian Bishop feels in conscience bound publicly to rebuke his former Chaplain and supporter, he will, if he cannot be generous, at least be scrupulously fair. That Dr. Henson's misrepresentation was intentional I did not suggest: that it was not actual I cannot admit.

J. S. BEZZANT.

Exeter College.

January 7th.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE STATE.

SIR,

I hope I shall not be thought impertinent if I make certain comments on the article by Mr. Oakeshott on 'The Authority of the State' in the Conference Number of the *Modern Churchman*. (a) On p. 318 Mr. Oakeshott confuses authority with the grounds for accepting authority. (b) On p. 323 Mr. Oakeshott puts forward the *desideratum* for the State that shall need 'to be linked on to the more comprehensive whole in order to be understood. . .'. He speaks of the social whole, which is correlated to individuals who are complete and living persons. This is to establish an ideal, as Hegel did, for the State (an ideal to which no actual State has, I think it can be argued, conformed, since States are not little-minded communities in basis). If, however, we are talking about the ideal community Mr. Oakeshott gives no reason why it should be limited in extent to the national State. He does not appear to advance beyond the expedient grounds dogmatically affirmed by Bosanquet as final ones. (c) On p. 324 again he rightly (although tautologically?) insists that a society must have organisation. He also asserts that a mere government is a sheer abstraction: I do not know what this means, but calling 'the State organisation regarded as government' as distinct from the citizen body organised by its government and laws is not an abstraction. Here, however, if we grant this point, it by no means follows in logic or in anthropology that a society, if it is to be organised, must be organised as a state, under state government. Emphatically societies otherwise organised than as states (national states?) are and have been 'facts.' Because Mr. Oakeshott happens to like this historical form of organisation it certainly does not follow that it is the only possible one or the only ideal one or the only one which can be 'dignified with the name of fact' (need facts be dignified?). There is the trick of the old Bosanquetian confidence trick: 'accept my values, and you will accept my conclusions'—of course. . .

I write this not as mere carping but because the fourteen conclusions from this very Bosanquetian and but too popular but very vulnerable argument seems to me to be most dangerous—as has been insisted now for some years past by at least one school.

Have you seen the little book on Politics by Beman and others of the Life and Liberty group? It has been sent me by them and, from the glance I have had time to take at it, seems quite good.

G. E. G. CATLIN.

Cornell University, U.S.A.

REPLY OF MR. OAKESHOTT.

SIR,

(a) I am aware that it is not unusual to distinguish between an 'authority' and the ground of it, but since this seemed to me to involve a confusion of thought I was forced to reject it. What I had hoped to show was that a person, doctrine, etc., distinguished from its logical ground, cannot be called an 'authority' because it is never authoritative. An 'authority' separated from its ground is not authoritative because it is a

ase abstraction, the mere aspect of an authority which happens to touch s. A policeman is not himself authoritative, but draws his authority from he law; while the law, as such, is not itself authoritative because it also, if it have feet of its own, still requires some ground upon which to stand them. That alone is itself authoritative which (like reason, in the sense in which I used the word) stands upon itself. The isolated aspect which ouches us is no more itself authoritative than is an isolated statement itself true, or an isolated act itself moral.

(b) Though the view I put forward owed much to Hegel and Bosanquet, I do not think I should be held responsible for their line of argument, which I regard as in many respects fallacious and which I did not myself use or refer to. And while I should welcome a critic who aimed at correcting my argument of fallacy, I find it difficult to know what to say to one who merely misread it in the light of writers to whom I made and intended no reference whatever.

Nowhere in my paper have I said anything which might lead a reader to suppose me to be speaking of an 'ideal' State. Nor does it seem to me necessary to regard as 'ideal' all conceptions of the State other than the ordinary historico-legal conception. The moral conception of personality is not 'ideal' because it is different from the legal conception.

And the conclusion which might properly be drawn from my argument is not that the 'national State' (which I never mentioned) is the 'ideal,' but that this historico-legal conception of the State is not only one among many, but is less complete than that which I recommended. It is absurd to assume that the word 'State' can have and ought to have a single meaning; all that is required is that it should have a single and intelligible meaning in any one argument. What I meant by it was neither something merely 'ideal,' nor anything in the phenomenal world. And to assail my argument on the basis of either of these meanings is to commit at once the *ignoratio elenchi* I spoke of on p. 319.

(c) In saying that mere government, as such, is an abstraction I meant that it is a mere aspect of social experience, inseparable from the whole, and not itself a self-complete fact. Society in its exclusively governmental aspect is an abstraction for the same reason as the purely numerical aspect of a collection of pictures is an abstraction.

And so far from indicating a preference for the 'national State' as the best form of organisation for all communities, or thinking of it as the only possible form of organisation, I nowhere used the word 'state' in this sense, and was careful to point out that I regarded such use as a merely legitimate technicality—analogueous to the lawyer's use of 'real' in the expression 'real property,' or to the 'universe' of the physicist. And since it was not I who introduced the subject of the 'ideal State,' I need scarcely say that my conclusions do not depend upon any esoteric 'values' of my own. But, of course, if an argument which makes no appeal to the writings of others is to be disposed of by the attribution of a name—Erastian, Hegelian, 'old Bosanquetian'—there must be an end to all rational discussion. And so far as I understand it myself, I had not conceived it more possible for my argument to be called Erastian than pink or mammalian.

MICHAEL OAKESHOTT.

Gonville and Caius College,
Cambridge.

PHYSICS AND DETERMINISM.

SIR,

In the Conference number of the *Modern Churchman*, the Archdeacon of Coventry is reported (pages 501-2) as saying in a sermon, preached during the Conference, as follows:—

'It is worth noticing that the postulate that the future is predetermined is being given up even in Physics. There are no more exciting pages in Professor Eddington's entrancing book, *The Nature of the Physical World*, than those in which he expands the principle of Indeterminacy. In its simplest terms this states that we cannot know accurately both the velocity and the position of a particle at the present instant. Thus the future of the particle is indeterminate. The physicist can be wise after the event, but not before it. The principle of Indeterminacy therefore reigns even in the physical world. The postulate that the future is predetermined does not hold even in its original home, the home from which it invaded psychology and philosophy. It was because men thought the future predetermined in the physical universe that they argued that the future was predetermined in the mental and spiritual world as well. The very basis of such an argument has disappeared, and the old notion that the mind is subject to deterministic law simply drops out.'

I have not read Prof. Eddington's book, but I assume that the Archdeacon has epitomised correctly the Professor's teaching about the principle of Indeterminacy when he says that 'in its simplest terms this states that we cannot know accurately both the velocity and the position of a particle at the present instant.' But from this premise the following deduction is drawn: 'Thus the future of the particle is indeterminate.' 'The principle of Indeterminacy therefore reigns even in the physical world.'

May I be allowed to question, with great deference, the validity of this conclusion? How can any such deduction be made from the imperfect knowledge possessed by the physicists of to-day? Or is it to be an axiom henceforth that the lack of accurate knowledge about any matter, physical, mental or spiritual, will bring such matter within the principle of Indeterminacy? If so, may we not say that logic 'simply drops out'?

G. A. BYRON.

Admiralty House, Lewes.

THE COMING MODERN CHURCHMEN'S CONFERENCE.

The seventeenth Modern Churchmen's Annual Conference will be held this year at Oxford, August 18th—23rd. The authorities of Somerville College and St. Hugh's College have kindly consented to accommodate the Conference members. The Conference subject is PROBLEMS OF PERSONAL LIFE. The Presidential Address by the Dean of St. Paul's will deal with *The Modern Outlook in Ethics*. Tickets and further information may be obtained from Miss Hilda Hubbard, Steeple Claydon, Bucks, the Honorary Secretary of the Conference. Membership of the Conference is open to all who are in general sympathy with the aims of the Modern Churchmen's Union. As accommodation is limited, applications for tickets should be made in good time.

HENRY D. A. MAJOR,

Chairman of the Conference Committee.